

1908

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 3, 1966

In the interests of sound government, the proposed constitutional amendment for a 4-year term for House Members merits our every consideration.

PORNOGRAPHY—ITS PERIL TO YOUTH

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier this year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a highly informative article on the subject of pornography, which had appeared in Columbia, the official magazine of the Knights of Columbus. I have just had a letter from the editor of that publication, Mr. Elmer Von Feldt.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS SUPREME COUNCIL,

New Haven, Conn., January 31, 1966.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I wish to express my thanks to you for placing the article on pornography appearing in the January issue of Columbia in the January 17 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The copy you sent is going to the author, Al Antczak. Mr. Antczak was the first of three articles in Columbia examining the perils of the pornographic trade in the United States.

Enclosed in the February edition of the magazine which carries a second article. I shall send you a copy of our third article as soon as the March issue comes off the press.

You will be happy to know that the Knights of Columbus, a 1,200,000-member Catholic fraternal organization, which publishes Columbia, has undertaken a nationwide program to alert our society to the danger to youth from the increasingly brazen pornographic productions in this country and is trying to organize community support for legislative, judicial, and executive action to halt this pestilential tide.

Sincerely,

ELMER VON FELDT,
Editor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the article to which Mr. Von Feldt refers, "Pornography—Its Peril to Youth," is a searching inquiry into many of the problems surrounding the question of smut, and the restrictions which should be placed on the sale of obscene materials.

I ask that this article, written by Mr. George Gent, TV editor of the New York Times, appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORNOGRAPHY; ITS PERIL TO YOUTH
(By George Gent)

(NOTE.—Many authorities who have studied the problem of obscenity feel certain it has noxious effects on youth, but they admit they have not yet come up with massive scientific proof to convince the doubters. Their own disturbing findings are detailed in this second of three Columbia articles on the menace of smut.)

The overriding concern of those alarmed by the rising tide of pornographic literature is its effect on youth and the moral fiber of our Nation.

Most of those active in the crusade to halt the flood of pornography work on the supposition that such literature must necessarily

be harmful to youth. Yet the majority of these will admit that they cannot provide any massive statistical proof for their assumption.

A significant fact in the pornographic trade is that more than ever before it is directed toward the young. It includes magazines that provide a step-by-step program for successful seduction and fully illustrated books of male and female perversion. The young are not spared even the horrors of illustrated bestiality.

Another category—the fastest growing and the one most authorities see as the greatest threat to psychic health—includes books and magazines that combine sexuality with violence. One of these is a comic book series that completely details sadistic methods of sexual fulfillment, including torture, whipping, branding, and the exquisite delight of amputating a woman's tongue. These are not words one puts on paper easily, yet they fill the fantasy life of a growing legion of American youths.

A most vivid memory during the preparation of this article was a visit to the Manhattan office of Operation Yorkville, an interfaith organization dedicated to eliminating the sale of obscene material to young people. During my interview with Father Morton Hill, S.J., the group's executive director, the phone rang and, after listening for a few minutes, the white-haired Jesuit priest blanched and beckoned me to listen on another extension.

On the other end was one of Operation Yorkville's many volunteers, a 55-year-old advertising executive who had just returned from a screening with a number of community leaders of a pornographic Swedish film that had been seized earlier that day by the New York City police. After describing the film, which dealt with youthful homosexuality, perversion and bestiality, the man, his voice quavering, said:

"I'm a mature man with a grown family and I haven't led a sheltered life, but I've never felt so unclean as after leaving that picture. I wanted to wash my hands and walk and walk until I felt fresh again. It was unbelievable."

Father Hill's office is filled with such material, much of it designed for young readers. He showed me the current copy of a respected literary magazine that featured 12 pages in color of metal sculptures that could be described only as pornographic. The magazine was readily available at the public library.

Americans differ strongly on whether it would be constitutional to suppress such material. The American Civil Liberties Union insists it would not. But another question that arises is whether it can be proved scientifically that pornography has a permanently harmful effect on young people.

Some psychiatrists—Dr. Frederic Wertham is probably the most prominent—insist that it has, but others equally renowned either deny such effects or maintain that proof is lacking.

Groups like Operation Yorkville and the Citizens for Decent Literature work on the assumption that a steady diet of pornography must have harmful effects on young minds and imaginations, but the scientific clincher is missing.

People on both sides of the issue admit that clarity would benefit from a thoroughgoing clinical and sociological study of the problem. But there are those, not at all unsympathetic to the value judgments of the antimut forces, who believe that even in the presence of overwhelming evidence, the issue ultimately will be decided on extra-scientific grounds.

Perhaps the most significant scientific endorsement of the anti-pornography position has come from the New York Academy of Medicine. In 1963, the academy published in its bulletin a statement based on a sampling of obscene literature by its Committee on Public Health. It said in part:

"The academy believes that although some adolescents may not be affected by the reading of salacious literature, others may be more vulnerable. Such reading encourages a morbid preoccupation with sex and interferes with the development of a healthy attitude and respect for the opposite sex. It is said to contribute to perversion. In the opinion of some psychiatrists, it may have an especially detrimental effect on disturbed adolescents. Behavior is complex. It is difficult, if not impossible, to prove scientifically that a direct causal relation exists between libidinous literature and socially unacceptable conduct. Yet it is undeniable that there has been a resurgence of venereal disease, particularly among teen-age youth, and that the rate of illegitimacy is climbing. It may be postulated that there is a correlation between these phenomena and the apparent rise in salacious literature, and perhaps it is causal, but the latter cannot be definitely demonstrated."

It should be noted that the academy's statement was based on a consensus among physicians and psychiatrists consulted by the subcommittee after a perusal of selected pornographic texts. It was not a controlled scientific study of young people addicted to such literature.

Few men have spent as many years in the clinical study of sex and violence in the mass media as has Dr. Frederic Wertham, the noted psychiatrist who has written two classic works on the subject, "The Show of Violence" and "Seduction of the Innocent." While Dr. Wertham's theories have been criticized, he has specialized in this area for over 35 years and has appeared as an expert witness in medicolegal cases throughout the country. His views have been discussed before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Dr. Wertham told Columbia he really feels the combination of sex with violence is the principal threat to psychic health today. Words like pornography and hard-core pornography are misleading, he said, because they lack precision and can be misused. "We have to be careful that we don't fall into the hands of the bigots whose real aim is to suppress sex," he said. The depiction of normal sex or even of eroticism within normal limits is not unhealthy, Dr. Wertham maintains, but when sex and violence are mixed, young people can be affected greatly.

Citing his essay on "Mass Media and Sex Deviation," Dr. Wertham said "the saturation of children's minds with brutality, violence and sadism has done, and is doing, unquestionable harm, including in the sexual sphere. It leads to a demoralization of healthy instincts. This influence on the psychosexual development of children and preadolescents takes place in various ways, through different mechanisms and of course to varying degrees."

He stated there is a direct link between violence and sex. "Sadism is contagious," he said. "It is quite wrong to think of sadism as just a form of aggression or hatred. Psychodynamically it is a short circuit connection between physical cruelty and sex. As well as being potentially socially dangerous, this link is always pathological. Anything that fosters this trend therefore is noxious to mental health."

Dr. Wertham cited numerous instances in his clinical experience where sadistic acts carried out by young people proved upon investigation to be associated with literature dealing with similar experiences. But even where no sadistic acts are committed he said, sadistic fantasies may become a stumbling block in the way of psychosexual development and a dependence on these fantasies may eventually wreck harmonious sexual adjustments in marriage.

Dr. Wertham rejects the widely held psychological theory that the representation of sadistic acts serves as a "safety valve" for

mous consent, further reading of the report was dispensed with, and the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 705) from the Committee on Un-American Activities and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 705

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusals and failures of George Franklin Dorsett to produce certain pertinent papers in compliance with a subpoena served upon him and as ordered before a duly authorized subcommittee of the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said George Franklin Dorsett may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATION TO UNITED STATES-MEXICO INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1966.
Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I very much regret it will be necessary for me to resign from the U.S. delegation to the United States-Mexican Interparliamentary Conference.

I have a number of previous commitments which are firm for the period of the conference and am unable to cancel them. I appreciate the privilege of being appointed as a representative from the House and hope this will not preclude my being considered at a future time as I continue to maintain a great interest in these meetings.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. SPRINGER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States inter-parliamentary group, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE], to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

COL. FRANK BORMAN'S ADVICE TO GARY, IND., YOUTH

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last month Gary, Ind., was indeed proud to honor a hometown boy, Astronaut Col. Frank Borman. The city celebrated his historical success in orbiting the globe

206 times, covering approximately 5.8 million miles in 14 days. Colonel Borman and his fellow astronaut, Capt. James A. Lovell, will be recorded in history as the pioneers in the first startling breakthrough on the scientific exploration of space.

The city of Gary can also be proud of the 12-hour program of ceremony, meetings, luncheon, and dinner honoring its space hero. Mayor Martin A. Katz, and James Rasmussen, the managing editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, were cochairmen of this event. They were assisted by a dozen special committees to aid them in the great task of extending a hero's welcome to a native son.

I believe the highlight of the day was when Colonel Borman spoke to an enthusiastic gathering of 6,000 schoolchildren in the Gary Memorial Auditorium. I wish to here submit to the Congress a verbatim message coming from the mind and heart of Colonel Borman to this great gathering of admiring youngsters. I only wish that every American schoolchild could have heard or someday will read the advice given by Astronaut Borman to the youthful gathering.

Colonel Borman's advice and message to the Gary schoolchildren was reprinted in the Gary Post-Tribune on January 15, 1966.

COLONEL BORMAN'S MESSAGE TO GARY'S YOUTH

Always at school assemblies someone has advice for the teenagers and youngsters, so I, too, have a little advice for you, based on my years of experience. I was for 3 years a teacher at the Military Academy—West Point—from 1957 to 1960.

You must get a good, solid, basic education. I want you to understand that I am being very sincere. I would like to list several things I would do if I could relive my youthful days.

EDUCATION

(1) I would do everything in my capability to continue my education on through high school and preferably into college. Those doors won't open any more without diplomas and you must have a good, basic background.

PATRIOTISM

(2) I would be patriotic. I would have a sense of duty to my country, to my school, to my city, and to my State. I think it is extremely important that we keep this sense of being proud to be an American. I hope you all have it, and I hope you never lose it.

RELIGION

(3) I would be religious. This sometimes seems to be out of date, but I am very proud of the fact that I am a lay reader in the Episcopal Church, and I hope that all of you continue your religion. I hope that none of you ever feel ashamed to have and to profess a basic belief in God. This is important. Believe me again as this is coming from an oldster now, but if I were starting all over, I would make sure that I had that.

HONOR

(4) The next thing I would do is make sure I had a sense of honor. I would be honest with my fellow Americans, with my fellow students, with my teachers, and I would be honest with myself. Again, these basic old virtues have not grown obsolete.

PRIDE

(5) I think the next one is something often overlooked, but I would have a sense of pride in myself. I would go around with my head held high. I would keep myself neat. I would be very proud to be an

American and a citizen of this wonderful country.

These are just a few words of advice for you. I hope you take them seriously, and I hope you think about them once in a while.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all across our country yesterday Americans joined in support of the President's decision. They recognized with few exceptions that the President had done all in his power to seek peace without resorting to the use of force.

A newspaper editorial which I feel caught the temper of our national sentiment with unusual clarity appeared yesterday afternoon in the Chicago Daily News under the headline "The Bombers Fly Again." It was a balanced, and thoughtful, expression of support for the President that recognized the inevitable debate which would be provoked by such a far-reaching decision. The editorial warned, however, that this debate must be "responsible and constructive rather than acrimonious and partisan."

This editorial is a significant example of the support the President has in this hour of national decision and debate. So that it may have the widest possible audience, I ask that it be printed in full in the record of our proceedings.

THE BOMBERS FLY AGAIN

Technically, few could fault the President's case for resuming the bombing of North Vietnam.

During the 37-day pause Mr. Johnson waged a worldwide peace offensive, earnestly seeking by every means consistent with reason and dignity to produce some reciprocal gesture by Hanoi. He might as well have been whistling in a tornado; the Communists weren't interested. He was forced to conclude that the Red leaders are satisfied that theirs is the winning position, that they feel they have only to hold fast and at some point the American people will despair of the rising cost in lives and treasure, and quit the field.

They were encouraged in this viewpoint by the thunderous silence that greeted Mr. Johnson's worldwide search for understanding and support. Except for a handful of doggedly faithful friends, the world advised the President that this was his commitment, his war and, by inference, his folly. If his going-in premise is right, that communism must be stopped in southeast Asia lest it engulf all Asia and tip the world power balance against the West, he had to bow to military imperatives and resume blasting the enemy's arteries of supply.

But an American public forced to accept the tragic prospect of steep escalation of draft calls and casualty lists will grasp eagerly at the hope, however faint, prompted by the President's sympathetic response to Pope Paul's proposal for arbitration by neutral nations under United Nations sponsorship. The President directed Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to carry the proposal to the Security Council.

By this and other means, the President said he will continue to pursue peace in a manner "as determined and unremitting as the pressure of our military strength on the field of battle." But he gave no sign of

ent: EDWIN E. WILLIS, Chairman; CHARLES L. WELTNER, JOHN M. ASHBROOK.

"The staff members present were: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The chairman called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m., and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the issuance of subpoenas for public hearings scheduled to be held in the Klan investigation in the near future.

"The director submitted to the subcommittee a list of prospective witnesses and explained why he deemed it necessary that they be called. On motion by Mr. ASHBROOK, seconded by Mr. WELTNER, and carried unanimously, the subcommittee authorized the issuance of subpoenas for the following individuals:

"North Carolina: * * * George Ben Dorsett.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m."

PAGE 5

The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on October 6, 1965:

"A quorum of the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated to conduct hearings concerning the activities of the various Ku Klux Klan organizations in the United States met in executive session on October 6, 1965, at 4:30 p.m., in Room 225 of the Cannon House Office Building. The following members were present: EDWIN E. WILLIS, Chairman; JOE R. POOL, CHARLES L. WELTNER, and JOHN H. BUCHANAN.

"The staff members present were: Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator, and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The chairman called the meeting to order at 4:50 p.m.

"On motion of Mr. POOL, seconded by Mr. BUCHANAN, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"WHEREAS, the subcommittee has authorized on September 30, 1965, and on today, subpoenas to be issued for a number of witnesses in connection with investigation of Klan organizations; and

"WHEREAS, the director has explained to the subcommittee the necessity and pertinency of issuing subpoenas with clauses duces tecum for the production of books, papers, and documents in the possession, custody, or control of witnesses identified variously as officers or members of respective Klan organizations, or organizations affiliated with such Klan organizations, or organizations created or controlled by and acting in support of such Klan activities or its members, who may be possessed of such books, papers, and documents, relating to the organization and the conduct of the business or affairs of such organizations, by virtue of their official position or which may be otherwise available to them, or of which they may be possessed or entitled to possession by virtue of the constitution and by-laws of the respective organizations;

"THEREFORE, Be it resolved that duces tecum clauses for the production of such books, papers, and documents are explicitly authorized for the subpoenas theretofore authorized on September 30, 1965, and those authorized today."

"The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m."

The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on January 6, 1966:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the Chairman to conduct hearings in Washington, D.C., under Committee resolution adopted March 30, 1965, to undertake an investigation of the various Ku Klux Klan organizations and their activities, met in executive session on January 6, 1966, in Room 429 of the Cannon House Office Building, at 12:05 p.m. The following members of the subcommittee were present: EDWIN E. WILLIS, Chairman; JOE R. POOL, CHARLES L. WELTNER, JOHN H. BUCHANAN.

"The staff members present were: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip R. Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recorder clerk.

"The subcommittee was called to order by Chairman WILLIS, who stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider what action the subcommittee should take regarding the refusals of: * * * George Franklin Dorsett in his appearance before the subcommittee on October 27, 1965, pursuant to a subpoena issued October 4, 1965, and served upon him on October 15, 1965 * * * to produce books, papers, records, and documents demanded in said subpoenas, which were pertinent to the subject or question under inquiry at the hearings conducted by the said subcommittee, and what recommendation the subcommittee would make to the full committee regarding their citation for contempt of the House of Representatives.

"After discussion of the testimony and proceedings and due consideration of the matter relating to George Franklin Dorsett, a motion was made by Mr. POOL, seconded by Mr. WELTNER, and unanimously carried, that a report of the facts relating to the refusals of George Franklin Dorsett to produce before said subcommittee the documents and items demanded of him as set forth in paragraphs numbered (1) and (2) in the attachment to his said subpoena dated October 4, 1965, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that the report of the said facts be reported to the House of Representatives, in order that the said George Franklin Dorsett be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, to the end that he may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

"The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m."

The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on January 13, 1966:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on January 13, 1966, at 9:45 a.m., in Room 429, Cannon House Office Building. The following members were present: EDWIN E. WILLIS, Chairman; RICHARD H. ICHORD, GEORGE F. SENNER, CHARLES L. WELTNER, DEL CLAWSON.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"Chairman WILLIS called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m., and announced that this special meeting of the Committee was called, after notice to all committee members, for two purposes, the first * * *, and the second to consider a recommendation of the subcommittee headed by the Chairman, Mr. WILLIS, appointed to conduct hearings in Washington, D.C., relating to the investigation of the various Klan organizations and their activities, which commenced on October 19, 1965, that * * *, George Franklin Dorsett, * * *, and * * *, be cited for contempt because of their wilful default in refusing to produce papers in

their appearance before the subcommittee, having been summoned by authority of the House of Representatives to produce certain papers.

"As to the second matter, the chairman reported to the committee that hearings were conducted by the subcommittee in Washington, D.C., commencing on October 19, 1965, and thereafter, as contemplated under the Resolution adopted by the committee on March 30, 1965; that the subcommittee met on October 19, 1965 and thereafter in the Caucus Room, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., to receive the testimony of several witnesses in public session, including the witnesses above-named, who had been duly summoned as witnesses to give testimony and to produce papers upon the matter under inquiry before the committee; * * *; that the witness, George Franklin Dorsett, was called and appeared before the subcommittee on October 27, 1965, a quorum of the subcommittee being in attendance; that the witness, George Franklin Dorsett, having been sworn as a witness, was asked to produce before said subcommittee the books, papers, records or documents demanded of him as set forth in paragraphs numbered (1) and (2) in the attachment to his subpoena issued October 4, 1965, and served upon him on October 15, 1965; that he willfully refused to produce said papers demanded of him; * * *; that the subcommittee duly met in executive session on January 6, 1966, a quorum of the subcommittee being in attendance, at which time motions were made and unanimously adopted with respect to each of said persons, to wit, * * *, George Franklin Dorsett, * * *, and * * *, that a report of the facts relating to the refusals of each of them to produce before the said subcommittee the papers and documents demanded of each of them as set forth herein, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that a report of the said facts relating to each of said witnesses be reported to the House of Representatives, in order that the said persons be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives and to the end that each may be proceeded against in manner and form provided by law.

"A motion was made by Mr. WELTNER, seconded by Mr. SENNER, that the subcommittee's report of the facts relating to the refusals of George Franklin Dorsett to produce before said subcommittee the papers and documents demanded of him as set forth in paragraphs numbered (1) and (2) in the attachment to his said subpoena dated October 4, 1965, be and the same is hereby approved and adopted, and that the Committee on Un-American Activities report the said failures of George Franklin Dorsett to the House of Representatives to the end that the said George Franklin Dorsett may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and that the Chairman of this Committee is hereby authorized and directed to prepare and file such report constituting the failures of the said George Franklin Dorsett. The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

"The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m."

[Illustrations identified as James Jones Exhibit No. 7B and George Dorsett Exhibits Nos. 10, 13, 14, and 15 are omitted because of mechanical limitations in printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All of the referenced exhibits, however, are fully illustrated in House Report No. 1247 which was filed and printed this date.]

(During the reading of the report, at the request of Mr. WILLIS, and by unani-

hopefulness that the effort would bear fruit, and there appeared no cause for any optimism.

So the Nation resumes its course along the dark tunnel with no daylight visible at the end and, indeed, no certainty of what may lie ahead. The range of possibilities runs from some sudden change of heart by Hanoi and Peiping, to an escalation that will one day bring Chinese troops pouring into North Vietnam and U.S. nuclear bombs raining on China's industrial centers.

In these circumstances, debate within this country is bound to increase in volume and intensity, for it is possible in this uncharted morass for men of equal sincerity to reason their way to opposite conclusions.

Debate, in Congress and out, will be heated and vigorous, as it should be. We can hope also, particularly as to Congress, that it will be responsible and constructive rather than acrimonious and partisan. For Congress has a job that transcends in importance to the Nation this year's congressional elections, important as they are—the job of helping to illuminate and shape national policy through these dangerous months, and to help make sure that the American people maintain their fundamental solidarity and integrity in support of the national effort. This is a strange and formless and unprecedented kind of war we are in, but it demands the same singleness of purpose any war requires when the Nation's future rests in the balance.

THERE IS AN AWFUL LOT OF PROGRESS IN BRAZIL

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the inception of the Castelo Branco government in Brazil there has been an unwarranted amount of criticism in our country about the policies and actions of that government. While its operation does not accord with our own procedures in all respects, nevertheless in view of Brazilian practice its policies have not been extraordinary.

What really is important, however, is the fact that the Castelo Branco recovery program is actually working. This can be proven by statistics and these figures are most impressive. The country will be nearly back on its feet in 1966.

In 1963 the inflation rate was 70.4 percent; in 1965 it was 45.5 percent. The trade balance in those years went from \$112 to \$400 million, while exchange reserves increased from \$168 to \$500 million. Income tax revenue increased from zero to 1.3 trillion cruzeiros.

When it is realized that Goulart was President during the full year of 1963 and also the first quarter of 1964, and the effect of his policies lingered on, this achievement is all the more impressive.

I am sure that all friends of Brazil will find this record most rewarding and will find in it a good augury for the future peace and security of the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I append a table of economic statistics.

Brazil's economic performance

	1963	1964	1965
Inflation rate.....	70.4 percent.....	86.6 percent.....	45.4 percent.....
Wholesale price increase.....	79.5 percent.....	93.3 percent.....	27.2 percent.....
GNP increase.....	1.4 percent.....	-3 percent.....	4 percent.....
Per capita GNP increase.....	-1.8 percent.....	-5.8 percent.....	0.8 percent.....
Exports.....	\$1,400,000,000.....	\$1,400,000,000.....	\$1,600,000,000.....
Manufactured exports.....	\$39,300,000.....	\$74,400,000.....	\$95,000,000.....
Trade balance.....	\$112,000,000.....	\$349,000,000.....	\$400,000,000.....
Balance of payments.....	-\$270,000,000.....	\$70,000,000.....	\$147,000,000.....
Exchange reserves.....	\$168,000,000.....	\$276,000,000.....	\$500,000,000.....
Income tax revenue.....	(1).....	Cr\$600,000,000,000.....	Cr\$1,300,000,000,000.....
Private foreign investment.....	\$4,500,000.....	\$3,600,000.....	\$25,000,000.....
Industrial production increase.....	0.3 percent.....	-0.4 percent.....	5 percent.....
Agricultural production increase.....	-0.9 percent.....	-4.5 percent.....	13 percent.....
Steel production (in tons).....	2,600,000.....	3,000,000.....	4,000,000.....
Crude oil production.....	66,000 barrels per day.....	62,000 barrels per day.....	100,000 barrels per day.....
Vehicle production.....	174,224.....	153,721.....	180,000.....

¹ Not available.

A PHYSICIAN'S REPORT FROM VIETNAM

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with consent of the House, I reprint herewith an excerpt of a personal letter from one of the physicians serving in South Vietnam. As background, he is a young man with a family, and his unit has been commended for the low percentage of loss of life from battle casualties in many recent operations—such as Operations "Crimp" and "Buckskin," in defense of the area immediately north of Saigon on the famed rubber plantation in support of the 1st Infantry Division—"Big Red."

I believe the personal letter which can be verified at length in my office, in-

cluding names and places, will be of particular interest to our colleagues at this time of decision—or lack thereof—concerning the support of our troops who have been committed voluntarily or otherwise, in southeast Asia. I say again, as I did on Thursday last, that we must untie the hands of our men of the military who are there committed and let them win, as win they will if turned loose and directed by the proper military under policies laid down by Congress within the Constitution, and on the spot:

We had some of the Air Force boys over for snacks last night (Saturday, January 22). They're really nice, fine fellows. They have been on rest and recuperation to Bangkok. Ran into some of our mutual friends from Karat (Thailand). They are really gloomy about the prospects of resuming North Vietnam bombing raids. Say the cease-fire has given them a chance to move their missile

and anti-aircraft locations—plus rebuild those that have been destroyed—also say that our missions, along with the way to fly them, comes from Washington. Tactically, this causes much loss of life. Guess L.B.J. is an expert in Air Force tactics as well.

Everyone's attitude is becoming fatalistic—it's very difficult to convince a man whose life is at stake 24 hours a day that the advantages of the cease-fire outweigh the tactical disadvantages (McNamara's). I hardly think a pilot hunting a new SAM site feels that way.

Am I overlooking the ultimate goals? Am I, too, concerned about individuals rather than the whole? But then, that's why America is America—concern for individuals—I thought, anyway. Can people continue to let the Government sell them out? If so, the predicted gloom of America's future is pressing toward us at an alarming rate of speed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all in this Chamber will agree that the writer is a thoughtful, perceptive and considerate person of prudence. He is in service and on station voluntarily, and although concerned, confused, and sometimes disgusted; those he speaks for and represents are dedicated and unquestionably loyal—in fighting for our Nation and freedom. It is time we listened, looked, and acted.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the lead article in the current issue of Life magazine, dated February 4, 1966, called "Concentration Camps for Dogs."

This article describes and illustrates a raid made by officers of the Humane Society of the United States upon the premises of a so-called dealer who makes a business of obtaining dogs from questionable sources, many of them stolen, and then sells them, either directly or through other dealers to research laboratories.

The sickening photographs and descriptive text document in black and white a practice that is conducted throughout the United States, that has been condemned many times in this very Chamber, and which is the target of a number of bills including my pet protection bill, H.R. 9743.

However, it is not actually necessary for us to wait until one of these bills is enacted before meaningful corrective measures can be taken. The largest single user of laboratory animals in the country is the U.S. Government. The National Institutes of Health uses about 100,000 dogs and cats per year. While the National Institutes of Health does have inspectors who investigate the premises of the dealers it buys from, it is impossible to check up on the sources of these animals. Consequently, many stolen pets, loved members of families like yours and mine, wind up dying on the operating tables of the National Institutes of Health. As a matter of fact, just a few weeks ago the National Institutes of Health returned to a Virginia farmer a pure-bred English setter which had been stolen from him

February 2, 1966

several months before and found in the National Institutes of Health's kennels.

There is a better way to obtain animals for research and, to help make it a reality, I have today written a letter to the Director of the National Institutes of Health urging the National Institutes of Health to stop buying animals from the usual dealers and to breed and raise their own. This would have a number of advantages. First, it would assure the Government of a steady supply of strong healthy animals, far superior to the emaciated, sickly animals dealers now provide, many of which die before they are ever used for the purpose for which they were purchased. Second, it would eliminate any possibility of stolen pets being used for research. Third, it may well save the Government substantial sums of money and, fourth, it is fitting and proper for NIH to set the pace in this area for the other laboratories throughout the Nation.

I sincerely hope that this suggestion will be seriously considered, and that my colleagues will join me in expressing their support of this idea to the National Institutes of Health.

LATEST U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS FAVORABLE TO COMMUNISTS HAVE HARMED MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a report.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the body of the RECORD, I include a supplemental report prepared by Mr. Harold W. Kennedy, county counsel of the county of Los Angeles, Calif.

The original report was widely circulated and widely acclaimed by public as well as private agencies throughout the country and the response to this was exceptionally fine.

This report was made at the request of the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and is completely objective, pointing out the effect of recent Supreme Court decisions which have been harmful to management, labor, and the American people, while at the same time have given a green light to the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Kennedy has received many national awards for his outstanding judicial publications.

I have been a close friend of Mr. Kennedy for more than 30 years and can attest to his character, ability, and integrity. He is one of the most respected men in the State of California.

LATEST U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS FAVORABLE TO COMMUNISTS HAVE HARMED MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
(Supplemental report of Harold W. Kennedy, county counsel of the county of Los Angeles, to the special report of August 19, 1964, filed with the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, August 1965)

INTRODUCTION TO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Approximately 1 year ago, on August 19, 1964, the county counsel of the county of

Los Angeles,¹ acting pursuant to a unanimous board order, filed with the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, a Special Report on Problem Created by Recent Supreme Court Cases Affecting the Communist Party.

That report, drawing on the unique and extensive background of the over 20 years experience of the county counsel in fighting subversion on the local and State levels, detailed the past antisubversive activity of that office and reviewed and commented upon the effects of certain recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in this vitally important area of the law.

The whole tenor of that report was an effort to set out in concise and readable form the unfortunate and disturbing trend of recent judicial opinions of our highest Federal court in the field of subversive control. Its purpose was to marshal and channel in an effective way the growing ground swell of public concern and alarm at the pattern of judicial thought which has emerged from our courts in recent years and which has effectively hampered the legislative and executive departments of government in their efforts to control and curtail the very real Communist conspiracy at work in our midst.

It was the hope of the author that the report would serve both as a point of reference and as a guide to concerted action: that by strengthening the attitude and opinions of those who have already recognized the danger of communism, and by suggesting the need for an immediate but orderly change in the negative direction that present judicial thought is taking, patriotic Americans everywhere could effectively join with those of us in government who have consistently voiced concern over recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions which are overbalanced in favor of subversive elements in our society.

Our judiciary is not insensitive to the needs of our time. The marshalled forces of American thought can create a social climate that will serve not only to reinforce the attitudes of those who have forthrightly recognized the danger of communism to our society, but will also serve to point the way to a change in judicial thought and action.

In the comparatively short period of time since its publication, the report has had a pronounced impact on local, State, and National levels. The report was the subject of a speech in the House of Representatives and was reprinted in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the U.S. Congress on September 23, 1964 (88th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 110, No. 183). Many national patriotic organizations such as the American Legion, the Americanism Educational League (Los Angeles, Calif.), the American Academy of Public Affairs, and others, passed resolutions commending the publication of the report and urging that it be read by their membership. One hundred sixty-five thousand copies of the report were made and, to date, approximately 140,000 copies have been distributed throughout the Nation. The greater part of those copies was printed entirely at private expense through the efforts of individual citizens, newspapers, church and patriotic organizations who, aware of the increasing and unceasing danger of the spread of the world Communist movement, have seen in the report a direct and useful means

¹ Harold W. Kennedy, County Counsel of the County of Los Angeles since 1945; B.A. 1923, Juris Doctor, 1925 Univ. of Calif., Berkeley; Master of Science in Public Administration, 1954, Univ. of Southern Calif.; 2d Lt. U.S. Army, 1918; Past President, National Assn. County and Prosecuting Attorneys and District Attorneys and County Counsels Assn. of Calif.; Past member Counter Subversive Activities Committee, American Legion, Dept. of Calif.; Calif. and American Bar Assns.

of alerting the American people. Since the publication of the report, this office has received a veritable flood of favorable mail from all sections of the country evidencing a tremendous grassroots response to the report's "Call to Action," which was directed to all public spirited Americans.

I. A QUERY: HAS OUR "CALL TO ACTION" BEEN ANSWERED?

Has our "call to action," to which our citizenry has responded so enthusiastically, evoked a corresponding response in the judiciary? Has the report, with its nationwide distribution and its overwhelming receptivity by Americans everywhere, had a discernible impact on judicial thought? Can there be seen, as through a glass darkly, a potential change of direction in judicial philosophy emerging from the latest judicial decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the field of internal security?

This supplemental report, prepared and filed pursuant to another unanimous board order of June 22, 1965, adopted on motion of Supervisor Ernest E. Debs, proposed to review and discuss two recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which were decided since the release of the county counsel's special report, and which acutely affect the country's continued and effective response to Communist subversion. The first case, *Lamont v. Postmaster General*, 14 L. ed. 2d 398, decided on May 24, 1965, represents a stinging defeat to our Government's efforts to control subversive use of the U.S. mail system. The other decision, *United States v. Brown*, 14 L. ed. 2d 484, decided on June 7, 1965, allowing Communists to hold union office, is highly disturbing to those engaged in strengthening our internal security, to management, and to the loyal segments of the American labor movement. Despite its immediate adverse effect, however, the Brown decision may well be considered as portending a change in the attitudes of the Supreme Court. In the final analysis, this case may signal the beginning of a judicial retreat from past inflexible positions taken by a majority of that Court.

II. WE CARRY THE MAIL FOR MOSCOW—THE U.S. SUPREME COURT GIVES FOREIGN-INSPIRED COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA UNRESTRICTED ACCESS TO OUR DOMESTIC MAIL SYSTEM

Communists consider their press and their publications to be the most important and effective tools for agitation, subversion, and propaganda purposes. Through the dissemination of newspapers, books, pamphlets, leaflets, and other printed material the party, both here and abroad, indoctrinates its members and party-line followers and is able to reach and propagandize students, young people, and other segments of the non-Communist public. Much of this Communist propaganda reaches the United States from foreign sources.

The Congress of the United States in a determined effort to control the large amounts of Communist propaganda originating in foreign countries from using our domestic mail system to reach an American audience, enacted section 305(a) of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962. This section provides in part:

"Mail matter, except sealed letters, which originates or which is printed or otherwise prepared in a foreign country and which is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulgated by him to be 'Communist political propaganda,' shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival for delivery in the United States, or upon its subsequent deposit in the United States domestic mails, and the addressee shall be notified that such matter has been received and will be delivered only upon the addressee's request, * * *"

To implement this law, the Post Office maintained 10 or 11 screening points for the

tion, and who are ready and willing to profit from our example.

One such leader is President Julius Nyerere, of Tanzania. In dedicating a hospital in Chimala built with a \$70,000 donation from the members of the Church of Christ in Texas, President Nyerere told thousands of his fellow countrymen that "Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example."

Religious organizations such as the Church of Christ are doing an immense amount of good work in hospital building and medical assistance in developing countries. The hospital in Chimala is the first one in the area. Its modern facilities, including a maternity ward and X-ray equipment, will serve thousands of people.

I am pleased that three Texans have been instrumental in planning and operating the hospital. Mr. Andrew M. Connally, of Arlington; Dr. Ron Huddleston, of Post; and Mrs. Florine Smalling, of Azle; each played important roles in bringing about the success of the project.

I wish to thank President Nyerere for his generous recognition of and kind words about the work done by Americans in his land. I hope that this is to be just one of many fruitful collaborations between Americans and Tanzanians.

I ask unanimous consent that an AP story from Dar-Es-Salaam and an article from the December 28 Fort Worth Star Telegram be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press]

DAR-ES-SALAAM, TANZANIA.—The President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, praised Americans Monday at the dedication of a mission hospital in Chimala.

"Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example," he told thousands of Tanzanians attending the opening of the hospital.

The Church of Christ Mission Hospital was built with \$70,000 donated by Church of Christ.

Nyerere said that through hard work Americans have become the richest people in the world and he told the Tanzanians that they also must work hard to make their country self-sufficient.

He said this was the first hospital in the area and he was pleased at the modern facilities, which include a maternity ward and X-ray equipment.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Dec. 28, 1965]

U.S. HOSPITAL IN TANZANIA CITED

President Julius Nyerere, of Tanzania, yesterday praised Americans during the dedication of a 50-bed hospital at Chimala for which funds were provided by 40 Church of Christ congregations in this area.

Andrew M. Connally, a Church of Christ missionary who has just returned for a furlough here from the east African country, said today the dedication marked the first time the President of a nation has opened a Church of Christ facility.

Connally was active in supervision of planning the hospital—the first in Tanzania.

Park Row Church of Christ in Arlington will supervise the hospital, and funds for its operation will be supplied by Churches of Christ in this area and individuals.

THREE YEARS ON DUTY

Connally spent 3 years in Tanzania. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Connally, of 3222 Avenue H. Mrs. Connally's parents are retired Fort Worthy Fire Capt. and Mrs. Homer Franklin, of 4010 Avenue H.

Both the missionary and his wife are graduates of Polytechnic High School. Their parents, who are members of Polytechnic Church of Christ, were active in the hospital building campaign.

The Church of Christ now has 43 churches and about 5,000 members in Tanzania, Connally said.

Dr. Ron Huddleston, a native of Post, and a graduate of Baylor University Medical School, is the physician serving the hospital. He will be succeeded later by Dr. Raymond Wheeler of Wichita, Kans., who is on the development committee of Abilene Christian College and a trustee of Oklahoma Christian College.

REGISTERED NURSE

The hospital's registered nurse is Mrs. Florine Smalling. Her husband, Wayne, a former engineer at General Dynamics—Fort Worth, is an administrator at the hospital. The Smallings are from Azle.

An area with a population of 100,000 is being served by the hospital.

Some of the elders of the Park Row Church, accompanied by Connally, plan to visit the hospital next year.

"Americans are hard-working people and we in Tanzania must try to follow their example," Nyerere said at the opening of the \$70,000 general hospital.

Nyerere said that through hard work Americans have become the richest people in the world and told the thousands of Tanzanians attending the ceremony that they also must work hard to make their country self-sufficient.

He expressed his pleasure at his country having the first hospital in the area and noted it included a maternity ward and X-ray equipment.

A Letter From a Serviceman in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I received a letter from Sgt. David L. Hogan, a resident of Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District who is among the thousands of American servicemen assigned to combat in South Vietnam. Because it speaks for the many courageous men and boys exposed to the gunfire, machinations, and treachery of an enemy dedicated to the destruction of the United States and of freemen everywhere, it is important that every Member of Congress read this message carefully. Under unanimous consent I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

OCTOBER 20, 1965.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Here is a little letter that I'm writing for all of the U.S. servicemen in Vietnam.

AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN

I'm writing this letter because I, like so many other servicemen, serving in the Republic of Vietnam, are getting tired of getting

the newspaper and reading about our fellow Americans putting on demonstrations back home, on the policies toward the Vietnam situation. It would be a lot nicer if when they got together, that they said a little prayer for the men in uniform that lost their lives over here fighting for the people back there in the United States, so that they can enjoy all of the freedoms that they now have.

I, like so many other American servicemen, am glad that I was given the opportunity to come over here, knowing that I was gladly serving my country and all that we stand for. It kind of gets to the man in uniform, when he passes by a little boy or girl of about three or four years old, and the little boy or girl stands back and gives you a salute as though you were a four-star general, instead of a dirty GI, that has just returned from a mission or patrol. It makes you feel wanted in this far-off country.

Mr. SAYLOR, I know that you have received many letters on this same subject, but I just want you to know that us servicemen that are from the State of Pennsylvania are always in there doing what we can and are always pulling for you and the President of the United States. Give the President my regards, and I'm wishing him a speedy recovery. This is just a very small portion of the way that the GI's feel over here toward the demonstrations.

Thank you for your time in reading this letter and your kind considerations toward others.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. DAVID L. HOGAN, RA13539745.

Mr. Speaker, it would be gratifying if it were possible to report to our men in Vietnam that the demonstrations of last year to which Sergeant Hogan refers have by now been dissipated in the new surge of patriotic fervor experienced by the vast majority of this Nation's citizenry. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Isolated bands of misguided demonstrators, prodded by Communist propagandists, persist in attempts to torment and to confuse in the hope that the U.S. policy will be reversed at the expense of the free world.

Whether the strategy employed by our Commander in Chief and his advisers is wholly sound may be open to question. Many of us in Congress have expressed areas of disagreement in the conduct of the military mission in Vietnam. Yet we stand in solid support of our Government's decision to carry out the commitment to protect our allies against the perfidious and diabolical designs of the Red vultures in Hanoi.

Though our fighting troops have every reason to resent anything less than national unanimity in appreciation of their efforts, Sergeant Hogan's letter is far from acrimonious. If it is asking too much for the anti-Vietnam demonstrators to pray for the men who have lost their lives in the present conflict, perhaps the very suggestion should stimulate increased prayer among the rest of the people in this country.

It may be time for the churches of America to begin sounding their bells at an appointed time each day as a reminder to all men, women, and children that our men in uniform are putting their lives on the line in the crusade against an enemy of God and of freemen. The gesture would give further assurance to what Sergeant Hogan and his buddies have known all along: that most Americans are grateful for the contributions of their fighting men and are praying

for their safety and success regardless of how much noise a few detractors may be able to create.

The 159th Birthday Anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by Dr. Frederic Shriver Klein, professor of history, Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

The remarks made by Dr. Klein were on the occasion of a commemorative program of the 159th birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee, sponsored by the District of Columbia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, held in Statuary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, January 22, 1966.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF ROBERT E. LEE, BY FREDERIC SHRIVER KLEIN, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

On the 1st of June 1962, on a battlefield only a few miles from Richmond, while the battle of Fair Oaks was still in progress, President Jefferson Davis turned to his companion and military adviser, and said, without warning, "General Lee, I shall assign you to the command of this army."

Two events that could have been called chance or might have been destiny, had unexpectedly brought a new figure to the stage of American history. A stray bullet and a piece of shell had wounded Gen. Joseph T. Johnston, commander of the Confederate forces defending Richmond; and his next in command, Gen. G. W. Smith, suffered an attack of what is now called battle fatigue.

Davis' statement at that moment meant that a man who otherwise might have played only a minor role in our Nation's military history was to take a position of responsibility which was to win for him a permanent place of honor and respect in the hearts of all Americans, as well as to make him a symbol of a way of life for all time. Robert E. Lee's military activities as commander of the Army of Northern Virginia lasted less than 3 years, and yet in that brief span of time he became a legend, not only for his army or for Virginia or for the South, but for all Americans for generations to come.

How did this man capture the imagination and win the devotion of soldiers and civilians alike, who knew little about him except that somehow he inspired their faith and confidence in his leadership? When he took command, he was not widely known for his military ability, although Gen. Winfield Scott, who had seen Lee's action in the Mexican War, had stated that Lee was the very best soldier he had ever seen in the field, and urged that Lee should be his successor in command of the Union Army at the outbreak of the war.

But Lee came to his command with some public criticism for his failure to drive the Federal forces out of western Virginia, and

had even been referred to as "Old Granny Lee," because he had been overcautious. He had been in charge of the seacoast defenses of South Carolina and Georgia, without much success, and his routine insistence on the digging of defensive earthworks did not help his popularity with his troops. There were no enthusiastic cheers from the ranks when the news of his command was announced, but Jefferson Davis had the same confidence in Lee which had been expressed by General Scott. The new commander's ability as a great military strategist was yet to be demonstrated, but it did not take long to become apparent.

The Lee legend did not develop from inspiring statements or immortal phrases by Lee which crystallized the objectives of the southern cause into memorable slogans for a great crusade. He was not in the habit of making them. It seems strange that there are few, if any, statements from Lee which have remained in the memory of Americans to typify his character or his ideals. His letters to his family are informal, warm, and wholesome, his military orders are simple and direct, and his few formal statements are adequate but not immortal. Even the impressive General Order No. 9, his farewell address to his troops, was drafted by his aide, Charles Marshall, as normal staff procedure. His deeds were to be much more significant than his words.

Nor did the Lee legend develop because of any dramatic emotional appeal, for he was not an exciting personality who captured popular imagination with an image of a gallant, reckless cavalier. There was none of the swashbuckling, sword-waving comradery so often associated with the popular idea of the typical Civil War officer, galloping along the ranks or stirring his troops with fiery words. Lee was quiet, outwardly, but those who knew him best recognized the constant activity of his alert mind.

Lee's career in the 50 years before the Civil War throws some light on the development of the qualities which were to earn universal esteem in the war years. It is not strange that he has been held in somewhat of the same reverence which has been given to Washington, for there was much of the Washington tradition in Lee's life. There had been an intimate relationship between his father, Light Horse Harry Lee, and General Washington and the legend of Washington must have played a prominent part in Lee's boyhood days, even though Robert's father left the country as an invalid when Lee was only 6 years old. But the shadow of Washington was constantly near Lee, through his life in Alexandria and at Arlington, where he lived with his wife, Mary Ann Custis, a descendant of Martha Washington. It was particularly appropriate that the words which his father had used in describing Washington, "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," would be used with reference to Lee when he was formally appointed a commander of the Virginia military forces.

Like his father, Robert E. Lee was primarily a soldier, and within the relatively small circle of army personnel, he was recognized as an excellent officer. He was second in his class at West Point, efficient as an engineer, and skillful in military tactics during the Mexican War. His only position of administrative importance was his appointment as Superintendent of West Point Military Academy, but he had acquired some public recognition as the result of his suppression of the John Brown raid at Harpers Ferry in 1859, when he was called upon to command the troops sent to the scene of the insurrection.

So, in the fateful early months of 1861, Robert E. Lee was a colonel of the 1st Regiment of Cavalry, U.S. Army, highly regarded by his superior officers, but not well known to the rank and file or to the general public.

He had not commanded large bodies of troops. He had no political experience and little political interest. He disapproved of slavery and of the idea of secession, but had made no impressive public statements. He loved his family, his Virginia home, and his chosen career in the Army. In these respects, there were many others like him. The responsibility of maintaining the Arlington estate occupied much of his time, and he seriously considered resigning from the Army to devote the rest of his life to the problems of managing a Virginia plantation. He could not have foreseen that when he left Arlington in April 1861 it would be lost to him forever.

What, then, was there about this man that was to mark him for a place in our Nation's history among the great Americans of all time? The 3 brief years of his Civil War career as an Army commander demonstrated almost immediately that he possessed two outstanding qualities that impressed friend and foe alike. His personal character represented the very best in the American tradition, and his military genius surpassed anything in American military history up to that time, and for many years to come.

The significant aspects of his personal character began to become apparent as soon as destiny selected him to lead the Army of Northern Virginia on June 1, 1862. Lee had a quality of quiet dignity which was as natural and normal to him as though he had been trained for a position of leadership during every previous moment of his life. It was a characteristic which became immediately apparent even to those who might have known him for only a short time, and which rarely failed to impress his associates. One of his acquaintances called him "the noblest looking man he ever saw," and the concept of nobility seemed to be associated with him constantly. It was recognized by contestants on both sides, and a northern newspaper, at the time of his death, only 5 years after the end of the bitter war, called him one of the few men who throughout the contest most nearly represented the idea of the true knightly soldier. Even at the height of the conflict, when both sides were hurling bitter and often exaggerated accounts of barbarities and atrocities, there was no chink in Lee's armor which could be attacked. "No man has so few enemies," wrote a British observer. Almost any officer could be, and usually was criticized for small personal vices, but Lee abhorred profanity, abstained from tobacco, and shunned alcohol. He was a large, handsome man, commanding in appearance, careful about personal details, and fond of neatness and order. He had a quiet humility which led him to take entire personal responsibility when failures occurred, and to refrain from criticism of others even when the faults were obvious. The New York Times commented, at the time of his death, "By his unobtrusive modesty and purity of life he has won the respect even of those who most bitterly deplore his course in the rebellion." It is significant that his former foes could deplore his stand, but they could not be angry or resentful toward him.

This knightly quality, so often romantically associated with the chivalry of the Old World, was a natural characteristic and not an assumed pose, as was so often the case with some of the military. He seemed to personify the aristocratic tradition—confident and assured on horseback on the battlefield, friendly and sympathetic to his troops, courteous and polite to his associates, gracious and gallant with the fair sex, and sincerely religious with simple and confident faith.

But it was not only the recognized nobility of character that raised the name of Robert E. Lee to a proud place in our history. Knightliness demands not only goodness and gallantry, but a knight must be able to fight

loring our shell-planting program to areas not infected and to areas we feel won't be infected."

The dramatic and relatively sudden invasion of MSX has tended to obscure the fact that it is not the sole ravager of oysters. Rosenfield places a fungus called Dermocystidium on the list of lethal pests, particularly because it is more active here than it used to be. There are also Minchinia costalis, only recently identified, and Bucephalus cuculus, an organism which, although it doesn't kill an oyster, renders it unable to reproduce. Ironically, it improves the oyster nutritionally.

Nonetheless, because its invasion has been so sudden, dramatic and devastating, MSX has gained most attention. As Rosenfield says, "People don't care until it affects them." And in the past couple of seasons, MSX has affected a lot of Marylanders.

The United Nations Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article published in the Covington Virginian of Covington, Va., on Saturday, October 30, 1965, and written by the Reverend Richard W. Buckingham, of the Epworth Methodist Church, of that city, entitled "Year of Crisis or Year of Opportunity."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YEAR OF CRISIS OR YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY
(By Richard W. Buckingham)

This is United Nations Week. Twenty years ago last Sunday, on October 24, 1945, the United Nations became a reality, for on that date a majority of the signatories—including China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States—had filed the necessary instruments of ratification. Hence, October 24 became United Nations Day.

We are a United Nations family; our son David, who was 20 years old last Sunday, was born the same day the United Nation became a recognized world force for peace. Not only so, the Atlantic Charter was issued "somewhere in the Atlantic" on August 14, 1941, and August 14 is my birthday. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference in Washington, D.C.—a forerunner of the United Nations Conference—concluded on October 7, 1944, and October 7 is my wife's birthday. And, the first United Nations Conference, attended by delegates from 50 nations, was held in San Francisco beginning on April 25, 1945; and April 25 is our daughter Mary's birthday.

So we are truly a United Nations family. The United Nations will be a man, of age, its 21st birthday in 1966, as will my son on United Nations Day, October 24, 1966.

Now 1966 is a year of possible crisis, for in 1966 the United States will observe the 25th anniversary of its entrance into World War II.

Ever since this Nation was "conceived in liberty" by the War of Independence, each generation of American youth has fought in a major war.

To put it another way, in the 170 years from 1775 to 1945, when World War II ended, our Nation has been engaged in war about every 25 years.

And as a matter of record, World War II began in 1939, exactly 25 years after the start of World War I in 1914.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six, then, may well be a year of crisis, for it is just 25 years removed—one generation—from 1941, the year we entered World War II. If history is to repeat itself, as it has for every previous generation of American youth, my son David and his generation can expect to enter World War III in about 1966.

It is a tragic fact that many of his classmates have already paid the supreme sacrifice, in the present world crisis.

What of 1966?

Will it be the year of great crisis, or is it to be the year of great opportunity? Will the United Nations, which just last Sunday ceased to be a "teenager," become "a man" and save the men of its generation from the catastrophe of another world conflict—a possible tragedy too horrible to imagine?

Or will the United Nations fail to measure up to its ideal for all mankind?

You can answer these questions by what you do or don't do in the next 12 months.

Will you help or will you hinder?

The U.N. needs and deserves your support. Will you help?

Vietnam: The Perimeter Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the United States retreating to the coast and then setting up defense in a few enclaves.

Mr. Max Freedman, a columnist for the Washington Post, presents some very cogent arguments why this is not proper action for the United States to take.

His column follows:

VIETNAM: THE PERIMETER THEORY

(By Max Freedman)

Neither a military nor a political case can be made out for fighting the war in Vietnam by withdrawing or limiting American power to Saigon and a few coastal areas. That is true despite the famous names, both in and out of Congress, that have spoken up these last few days in favor of this proposal.

In essence this plan is based on the mistaken military notion that it is sometimes easier to defend a perimeter than a citadel. In Vietnam today there are no citadels and few perimeters. The United States would be doomed under this plan to be an occupying power in part of South Vietnam after it had conceded and accepted defeat in the rest of the country.

If this plan were adopted, the United States would find its strong points dependent for its food supplies on a countryside that was either controlled by the Vietcong or by villages who no longer cared what happened to American troops. It is impossible to think of a single valid reason why the people in the villages should lift a finger to help us once we had withdrawn to our own selected positions.

What this plan means, therefore, is that we would seek a relatively stronger and safer position for ourselves by abandoning the rest of South Vietnam to the Communists. What assurance is there that we would in fact have any security? The Communists, scenting our weakness, and aided now by a population suffering from a sense of betrayal, would keep up the attack. Cooped up in stationary posi-

tions, caught in a sort of weak Maginot Line, unable to use the military asset of surprise or to take the offensive, the American forces would soon find that their strong positions were in fact dangerously weak.

But suppose this plan, in defiance of all military logic and experience, actually works? The United States, by its own decision, on its own authority, in defiance of its pledges, would be responsible for the partition of South Vietnam.

If there were any political leaders in cooped-up Saigon willing to work with us, they would form the most despicable of puppet governments. They would have no authority in the rest of the country with their own people. For the United States, in these changed circumstances, would have no power except the base and fleeting power of a military giant occupying part of a distant land that does not belong to him.

It is being said, rather late in the day, that the United States has no obligation to fight to the bitter end to vindicate the territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Putting aside that argument for a moment, what obligation have we to partition South Vietnam to suit our imagined military convenience? If another country did this, we would denounce it as blundering and brutal imperialism, and we would be right.

We would not, in reality, have even a perimeter to defend for very long. The more this plan is examined the clearer it becomes that it is the prelude to a settlement based on retreat, withdrawal, and defeat.

The last touch of unreality is given to this plan when it is remembered that its advocates have used the loudest arguments in the past to tell us that no struggle against Communist subversion can be won by guns and military power alone. The war has to rest on foundations of political, economic, and social reality. Above all a successful war has to enlist the sympathy and support of the ordinary people.

The plan outrages every one of these principles. It thinks in military terms alone. It cares nothing for the unity of South Vietnam or for the welfare of its people. It cares only about saving American lives and easing American burdens.

It is not a candid and prudent limitation of American aims in a dangerous war whose end no one can foresee. It is selfish folly dressed up as a deceptive policy, and if it were ever tried it would be a shattering failure.

The worst thing about war is that it forbids easy solutions. It makes no sense to get out of Vietnam. It makes even less sense to get half out. There will have to be harder thoughts and harder battles before the end comes into sight.

President Nyerere of Tanzania Pays Tribute to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, anyone who reads the newspapers knows that the United States is frequently criticized abroad. We must realize that in many cases this criticism is motivated by the fact that as the freest and most prosperous nation on earth we are a handy target. It is nice to know there are able leaders abroad who recognize the reasons why we occupy that posi-

Appendix

MSX: Deadly New Enemy of the Oyster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the prolonged drought in the Northeast are most evident in their everyday, dramatic aspects. The hidden, side effects of the water famine are just beginning to appear.

Still one more effect is revealed in an excellent article by James F. Waesche in the Baltimore Sunday Sun. He tells of the appearance of a bacteria destroying oysters and possibly, other seafood. The bacteria thrives only in salt water, but the lowered fresh water levels is allowing the saline-living bacteria further progress in Chesapeake Bay.

The article points up the urgency and the necessity for the overall survey of the Chesapeake Bay area, including Baltimore Harbor, legislation introduced by me in last year's session and passed by the House and Senate. President Johnson allowed funds to begin this study in his budget message. We believed that the sea nettle was largely responsible for the decline in revenues from bay products and recreation, but this article reveals the menace of still another enemy. The survey of the Chesapeake region evidently should not be delayed.

In an effort to give wider readership to this article, I ask its inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MSX: DEADLY NEW ENEMY OF THE OYSTER
(By James F. Waesche)

A mysterious protozoan parasite, MSX, has been drifting up Chesapeake Bay the way an invisible, odorless cloud of lethal gas would roll over a city: silently, but with disastrous effects. Wherever it has appeared oysters have perished and the industry dependent upon them has collapsed.

Delaware Bay was hit first. MSX wiped out the oysters there in 1957. In 1958 it was discovered in the mouth of the Chesapeake. In 2 years it had reached the Maryland-Virginia line—after ravaging oyster grounds to the south. This year researchers have found evidence of it as far north as the mouth of the Choptank.

Already it has taken its toll in Maryland. Crisfield has been particularly hard hit. "The oyster business here is dead," lamented a Crisfielder close to the industry; and, although its comments are more cautiously phrased, the Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs tends to agree. "MSX has certainly hurt the economy of the Crisfield area," an official acknowledged.

(It is said, incidentally, that a few Crisfield packers, desperate for oysters, are buying them in Baltimore, trucking them to Crisfield, then repacking them and shipping them to out-of-State markets as bonnet bouches from the Seafood Capital of the World.)

The problem is not Crisfield's alone. MSX investigators are labeling the parasite "a distinct threat from Virginia north to the Hoga." Also, they note, "more dead oysters have been reported this year than before."

What's drawing—or what's propelling—MSX up the bay? Changing salinities scientists say. The oyster-killing parasite seems to thrive only in water containing more than 15 parts salt per 1,000 parts fresh water. Until recently, Maryland's portion of the bay was never that salty. It has become so lately though, because of the prolonged drought in New York and Pennsylvania. Lack of rain there has greatly decreased the volume and flow of the Susquehanna River, which, under normal conditions, supplies the bay with 90 percent of the fresh water it receives from sources north of the Potomac.

Because less fresh water is flowing into the head of the bay, salt water from the ocean has been able to push farther and farther up the mouth, causing the isohaline—the imaginary line that divides the relatively salty portion of the bay from the less salty portion—to move steadily northward, providing more and more "living space" for MSX. At present the isohaline stretches from the mouth of the Choptank on the Eastern Shore to Cove Point on the western. It is 40 miles closer to Baltimore than it was 5 years ago.

"And it's getting higher," remarks Frederick W. Sieling, chief of CBA's Natural Resources Management Division. "Unless there's a change in the rainfall pattern, it'll get higher still."

He points out that the isohaline, roughly 25 miles long, crosses the bay as a sharp diagonal. It is much higher on the Eastern Shore than on the western. Several factors cause this. One of the most surprising is the rotation of the earth, which tends to slosh waters from the western side of the bay upward and against the Eastern Shore. Then too, the deep channel is on the eastern side.

"Creeping salinity" is, so far, one of the few concrete things that MSX researchers have to go on. They know little about the parasite itself. The letters MSX, in fact, stand for multinucleate sphere unknown. Only one of the organism's life stages has been identified—the one which lives in and kills the oyster. It may spend part of its life in some other animal, or in the water, or in both. Biologists don't know. Neither do they know how it is transmitted from one oyster to another. Experiments have shown only that a healthy oyster cannot catch MSX from an infected one.

Since its life stages can't be charted, its origin remains a mystery. There are, however, some hazy hypotheses. Sieling summarizes them:

"There are two possibilities," he says. "One is that MSX may be something that has been here all along—something that underwent a sudden mutation and became lethal. But the chances of such a mutation, I feel, are rather remote. It would be like picking one star out of the sky.

"The other is that MSX may be something that has been introduced into these waters from another area—something that may have been a parasite in another animal, one that was resistant to it, that then found a happy home in the oyster. There are many chances for this to have happened in Delaware Bay, where there are so many oceangoing ships that may have had mollusks or fouling on

their bottoms. I personally lean toward this theory."

The parasite could also have been introduced by humans, he suggests, much in the way milfoil, an exotic weed that has spread unchecked and clogged many a bay estuary, was dumped into local waters from fish bowls.

In an effort to replace the "X" with a good, long Latin name, research programs are underway in laboratories up and down the coast. Closely following MSX as it sweeps up the Chesapeake is the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries lab at Oxford. The program there is under the direction of Aaron Rosenfield, Ph. D.

"One of the first signs of infection is in the gills," Rosenfield says, adding that some biologists have thus concluded that the parasite is waterborne. "Oyster blood cells flock to the area of infection. This can be picked up on the microscope, so this is how we know that it infects the gills first."

MSX does its damage, however, in the oyster's digestive tract. It seems to settle there, multiplying and filling the space where the oyster's food should be. Apparently the oyster starves to death.

MSX is harmless to humans. "We've eaten infected oysters here in the lab," says Rosenfield, "and everybody's still walking around."

Many people have probably eaten infected oysters without knowing it. The parasite is tasteless. Its presence can sometimes be detected by a keen eye, however, for it blanches the digestive tract, normally a dark brownish-orange.

With so little known about the parasite itself, biologists are hoping to stem its advance and salvage the industry by discovering in nature (or learning to breed) an MSX-resistant oyster. Hopes are based on evidence that a resistant strain seems to be developing naturally in Delaware Bay.

Some 90 percent of the oysters there fell victim to MSX in 1957. Ten percent survived—either by resisting the initial onslaught of the parasite or, if attacked by it, managing somehow to "get well." (Rosenfield says that in the lab an oyster has been "caught in the act of 'spitting out' the organism.")

Biologists call survivors a "relic population," and they note that the progeny of such a population tends to maintain its parents' resistance or immunity. There is now, for instance, only 15 percent mortality among the progeny of the Delaware Bay relic population, whereas oysters from other waters, when put in the still-infested bay, die en masse.

What makes a resistant oyster different from a susceptible one? Rosenfield and his staff are trying to find out.

Rosenfield is spending most of his own research time making chromosomal analyses.

There may be, he says, chromosomal abnormalities in resistant (or even in susceptible) oysters, abnormalities similar to the one that produces mongolism in humans. If one exists, it could be possible to breed a new, MSX-resistant strain.

Chesapeake Bay Affairs and Oxford are cooperating in the anti-MSX campaign. Many of the samples with which the lab works are obtained by CBA. CBA also conducts continuous sampling programs in the bay, checking both salinities and mortalities.

"We're doing everything we can to keep track of it," Sieling says, "and we're tai-

service in Washington beginning in 1948, including the 8 years as Vice Chief and Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White was the prime architect and supporter for the successful ballistic missile and aerospace programs undertaken and developed during the 1950's.

Following his retirement in 1961, General White was a contributing editor of Newsweek magazine, a member of the General Advisory Committee of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a member of the Washington Institute of Foreign Affairs, an associate member of the Institute of Strategic Studies in London, a member of the Congressional Board of Visitors, U.S. Air Force Academy, and a member of the board of directors of several major companies.

Among General White's decorations were the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Air Medal, and many foreign decorations.

The Nation and this Congress have lost a devoted military authority, as well as a cultured gentleman, diplomat, linguist, and friend. We shall miss his wise counsel on many matters affecting our national security, particularly in the field of aerospace power. His forward thinking, his devotion to his country, his dedication to making United States aerospace power preeminent, above all his integrity, will forever mark General White as both a great airman and a great American.

General White appeared many times before committees of our Congress. We all recall that his testimony was invariably sincere, courageous, and accurate. He was not one to go off on tangents, or to be influenced by extremist solutions to our national problems. He impressed all on committee hearings with his fine, gentlemanly manner and his intellectual genius. We shall miss his stability and foresight.

Let us salute with pride a gallant gentleman, Thomas Dresser White.

PRESIDENT ACTS FOR AMERICAN FORCES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe President Johnson acted courageously and with sincere concern for the protection of American forces by renewing the bombing raids on the Communist strongholds in North Vietnam.

No reasonable person wishes to create a condition which can lead to world war III, but neither could the President, as Commander in Chief of our military forces, ignore the obvious buildup of manpower and warmaking materiel posed against our forces in South Vietnam.

President Johnson made a noble and extensive effort to reach a peaceful solution to the fighting in Vietnam and he was rebuffed. I hope he continues these efforts to bring an end to the fighting but, until that day arrives, the President is duty bound to give our young men risking their lives in the battlefields every assistance.

We in the Senate should join him in this endeavor. He has my support.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the President's International Education Act sets before us an agenda of what we can do to increase understanding between nations.

We hope to strengthen our education here at home through this legislation. We hope to build bridges of understanding between nations by offering and increasing our technical assistance programs abroad. We hope to give children in other lands a "head start" and, finally, we hope to give to visiting students from other countries a chance to develop their full potential as future leaders.

It is clear that a neglected dimension of our foreign policy has been cultural exchange. It is time now for a review and reappraisal of all our efforts in this field.

I support the Exchange Peace Corps, a program to allow foreign visitors to come to our country, for it is clear that foreign students and teachers here can help in language instruction and can assist our schools in adding an international dimension to their courses of study.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is the status of the Senate rules under which the Senate is operating in this session of Congress? When were they last approved or adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are the rules set forth in the Manual of the 89th Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. When did the Senate itself last give approval to those rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last general revision was in 1884.

Mr. McCARTHY. Periodically we pass upon the rules of this body. If the question of whether the Senate is a continuing body—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not required to pass on them periodically.

Mr. McCARTHY. When did the Senate last take formal action with respect to the rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There were some amendments made at the beginning of this Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. Some amendments were made, but there was no action to approve the rules with respect to this body. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate made certain changes in its rules. Mr. McCARTHY. Might I therefore be in order to raise a question with reference to all the rules at this particular time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can amend its rules.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senate is a continuing body, as some Senators insist, would it be in order to interrupt at this time to consider the amendment of the rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate's attention is referred to rule XXXII, paragraph 2 of the rules of the Senate, which reads:

The Rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these Rules.

Mr. McCARTHY. In further parliamentary inquiry, what would be the procedure if it were sought to change the rules of the Senate in different respects?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A proposal to change the rules requires 1 day's notification. Then it is decided by majority vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the question should be raised as to whether or not there could be unlimited debate with reference to a proposed change in the rules of the Senate, who would decide that question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a debatable question. Cloture could be invoked.

Mr. McCARTHY. Cloture could be invoked. How would it be invoked. Would it require a two-thirds vote? Or is it an open question as to whether it could be decided by majority vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is debatable. It can be voted on by majority vote, but cloture requires a vote of two-thirds of Senators present and voting.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask for precedent on the requirement of a two-thirds vote for cloture under the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentary calls the Chair's attention to rule XX, paragraph 2, in this particular:

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Mr. McCARTHY. What if it were proposed to amend that section of the rule? We cannot invoke a rule on a rule to enforce a change of that particular portion of the rule. We would have to go outside to look for a course of action in that instance. Would not that question have to go to the Senate to be decided by a majority of the Senate, depending on the ruling of the Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This rule is treated the same as any other rule of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Therefore, that rule would be subject to the constitutional provision which allows the Senate to make its own rules. So far as we know, the Constitution allows the Senate to make its own rules by majority vote on any matter which concerns itself. Under the Constitution, that question can be decided by majority vote. Or is that a matter for the Supreme Court?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Rules of the Senate can be amended by majority vote once that question is reached.

Mr. McCARTHY. The rules of the Senate can be amended by majority vote, but the question is whether cloture can be voted on a proposal to change the rules, or whether it would be subject to a determination by the Senate following a ruling by the Presiding Officer. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Senate is referred to that part of rule XXXII—

Mr. McCARTHY. But it is proposed to amend rule XXXII. Therefore, rule XXXII could not apply to amendment of rule XXXII, unless we have locked ourselves into something which we cannot break out of. In most cases we go outside and rely on the Constitution.

Let me raise this one point, and then I am finished. In order to amend the rules of the Senate under the present practice, at any time a rule of the Senate is subject to amendment by a Member of the Senate, subject to the action that may be taken by that body. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota and my other colleagues that the way to amend the rules of the Senate is very simple. It requires a simple procedure. All we have to do is to get a majority of the Subcommittee on Rules and Administration to report any one of the 75 proposed rule changes which I have been submitting for the past 10 years and bring it to the full Committee on Rules and Administration, where, if the chairman of the committee, our revered and beloved Senator HAYDEN, who is also chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which has received permission to meet, will permit it to be brought before the Senate, I have no doubt that a majority would vote to change the rules. I am at a loss to know why the Senator from Arizona has not moved to report the proposed changes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. On that very point, while it is true that a majority vote is required to change the rules, it would take a vote of two-thirds of Senators present and voting for the privilege of considering the matter. That is why we are boxed in.

Mr. CLARK. That is true; but under the rulings made by the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, if the effort is made

at the time the Senate first meets at the beginning of a Congress, and if the rights under that constitutional privilege are reserved, the question is pending, and all rights are reserved under the Anderson motion to change rule XXII, which would bring it up, and even this motion would be debatable.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true, but if an appeal is taken from the ruling, it is subject to debate, and it is subject to a two-thirds vote to stop the filibuster.

Mr. CLARK. But the constitutional ruling is that it is not subject to debate; and the present Vice President, if pressed hard enough, would so rule, I am sure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I just read that the Research Association at Princeton reported—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for sufficient time to propound a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Research Association at Princeton reported that only 14 percent of the people in this Nation wanted the repeal bill to be passed and that the majority of union members did not want it passed.

Why should we change the rules of the Senate to do what the Nation does not want done?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not yield until I get an answer. I would like to have an answer, if one is available.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe we should not have a change of the rule for this measure only but for many other measures as well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, why bring it up at this time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Action on anything can be prevented by 33 percent. Why should we not change the rules so as to give to 14 percent the right to protection that the Senator wishes to give to 33 percent?

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator has any hope of getting enough votes to operate under the present rules, why does not some Senator take up the arguments made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on the floor of the Senate last Saturday? His argument cannot be answered.

Mr. McCARTHY. What argument did he make?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator cannot answer them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, are we in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is transacting morning business.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia. If he is so sure that 14

percent want repeal, why not let the question come to a vote? That would be the end of the discussion.

But I am already convinced that the only reason why they do not want this matter to come to a yea-and-nay vote and be subject to the majority vote of the Senate is that they do not believe what they are reading.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall answer the question. The Senator will not find 1 percent of the people favoring it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet next Friday while the Senate is in session.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance and full sentiment with the request of the Senator that I make a motion to table.

I wish to make it clear that the leadership is eager to cooperate with the Senator to the end that his committee may meet. Any motion that committees may meet is subject to debate.

In my judgment it would be a mistake for the leadership to permit the motion to proceed to the consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) to be displaced by a motion that committees meet.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 22 Leg.]		
Aiken	Dirksen	Mansfield
Bartlett	Ellender	McClellan
Bass	Fulbright	Mondale
Bennett	Gore	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Church	Javits	Ribicoff
Clark	Kuchel	Tower
Cooper	Long, La.	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

to request emergency action in the U.N. Security Council. Let us hope that here is an avenue that may lead Hanoi to a serious discussion of peace.

We must be mindful, however, that Hanoi has as yet not disclosed a serious interest in peace, and today is indicating its indifference to any action which might be taken by the United Nations.

For while we and others have sought since last April to bring Hanoi to serious discussions, a long record of terrorism and violence leveled at the people of South Vietnam has been the only response.

It is therefore important that we realize that we must continue to support our commitment to the South Vietnamese people and the U.S. forces there.

This we will do; and I am sure that, as Secretary Rusk has stated, the United States will continue to explore the processes of diplomacy, both public and private, in order that any possibility of peace can be explored and tested.

Turning to another, but related, matter, yesterday we received a message from the President, submitting his foreign aid program. This program is less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the national defense budget, and for that reason its extension can, in my opinion, be largely justified.

I am delighted that the President says that from now on he wants to help nations which help themselves. This is progress, because in years gone by we were willing to help nations under any circumstances, without any regard to whether they helped themselves or anybody else. That was a rather immature approach in my judgment. For this reason I welcome the President's intention to limit economic assistance to those nations which help themselves.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that we might even take a further step. We might even be so bold as to propose that some day we will help only those who help us. But I suppose that is too revolutionary a proposal to bring up at a time like this, especially when so many people in this country do not even want to help the President.

In his foreign aid message the President said that nine-tenths of the \$665 million earmarked for development loans is for five countries.

One of these countries is Nigeria. On the same day, and almost at the same hour that the President was transmitting his foreign aid message to Congress, the Nigerian representative on the United Nations Security Council was refusing to support the American request that the Council take up the question of whether the United Nations should discuss the Vietnamese problem. In fact, all three African members of the Security Council opposed our simple and reasonable request which needs nine affirmative votes for adoption. I recall, parenthetically, that only last fall at the International Telecommunications Union Conference at Montreux, Switzerland, where I was a U.S. delegate, all 32 of the African delegates refused to support the position of the United States in a matter of importance.

I have supported foreign aid to a number of countries, including a number of African countries. I expect to continue to do so. But I shall not be bulldozed or blackmailed or threatened by a statement that any part of the world is immune, or that any nation in the world is immune, from criticism because of considerations other than their governmental actions. When they do not help us, as Nigeria refused to help us yesterday, we ought to bear in mind the limited resources available for development loans and take a good hard look to see whether or not we ought to spend them on a country that only yesterday, while we were offering development loans to it, was saying to us, "We do not believe enough in free speech to permit the United States to take its cause to the United Nations."

Fifteen Senators have submitted to the President their dissent from and concern over his Vietnam policy. They have urged him to reconsider the course of action on which he has embarked. Some of them have been heard to say, "Let us take the problem to the United Nations." So we try, and the next thing that happens is that we cannot even get enough members of the Security Council to agree merely to take it up.

Most people, like myself, I suppose, thought that the only member of the Security Council which would not want to take it up would be the Soviet Union. But lo and behold, our longtime, great ally, France, joined Russia. What purpose other than petty mischief France had in taking such action, I cannot understand. Whereupon the whole kit and kaboodle of the nations which have enjoyed our assistance sought to embarrass this Government, saying, "We will not even let you talk about it."

If that is all that the United Nations is willing to do, we may have to say that we have run our string out there. If that is the case, we must stand alone with our valiant Vietnamese ally and with the assistance of a few friendly allies, such as South Korea, the United Kingdom, and Australia. For we must do whatever is necessary to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion. I think every one of us strongly supported every step of the President's peace offensive. Now, most of us are ready to go ahead to seek an honorable settlement by using such force as may be necessary to bring about the negotiations leading to that settlement.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his kindness in yielding to me.

W
MORE COMMONSENSE FROM
SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of all the Senators who have preceded me, and to whom I have yielded, precede in the RECORD the remarks I shall make. I should like to preserve the continuity of my remarks. I feel certain that no Senator will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under the same conditions on which I have yielded to other Senators, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me. I asked him to yield for the purpose of obtaining unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a transcript of the discussion between the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and two noted Columbia Broadcasting System news correspondents, Mr. Eric Sevareid and Mr. Martin Agronsky. The discussion took place on the CBS Network between 10:30 and 11 o'clock last night, Eastern Standard Time. It was another impressive demonstration of Senator FULBRIGHT's uncommon commonsense.

Much of the discussion centered around the issue of Vietnam, and our policy not only in that country, but in other parts of Asia as well. The discussion was a most thoughtful, interesting, and forthright statement of the issues.

Near the end of the broadcast, Mr. Sevareid asked Senator FULBRIGHT if he thought that high ranking public officials could afford the luxury of public pessimism. Senator FULBRIGHT offered what I believe to be a perfect answer.

He said:

It seems to me that we all get along better if we say what we think, whether it is pessimistic or optimistic.

That is a good admonition to all of us. It is sometimes difficult to speak out on controversial questions, particularly at a time when our country is committed to battle. No one enjoys the prospect of having his words twisted in such a way as to imply that he has somehow undercut what our troops are trying to accomplish or has undercut the national interest in any way. But there has never been a time in our history when plain, honest talk was so desperately needed. And every Senator speaks for war or peace by his silence as well as by his words.

We are involved in what I believe is the most dangerous venture in which this country has ever been engaged. We must turn every possible stone in an effort to end this war and to bring it to a conclusion before we are pulled into what would be the most disastrous development that anyone could imagine, and that is a major all-out war on the Asian mainland.

In my judgment the great generals who have warned us against that in the past have been absolutely right. I believe that it would be calamitous for this country to take steps which would bring on such a war.

I hope that we will do everything we can to prevent that. I believe that the President wants to avoid that kind of a conflict but he needs to hear our honest convictions about this ill-advised venture in Vietnam.

One way to avoid an even larger conflict is by honest talk. If Senators will only speak out and say what they really

believe on this issue, it will be far more helpful than if they refrain from saying what is on their conscience and on their minds.

I hope that we may have a thorough discussion not only of the Vietnamese issue, but also of our entire policy in Asia. It is of the utmost importance to us and to our children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the very thoughtful discussion by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT: ADVICE AND DISSENT

(CBS News special report, as broadcast on the CBS Television Network and the CBS Radio Network, Feb. 1, 1966)

Guest: The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, U.S. Senate, Democrat, of Arkansas.

CBS News correspondents: Eric Sevareid, Martin Agronsky.

Producer: William J. Small.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

Mr. AGRONSKY. This is room 1215 in the New Senate Office Building, the entrance to the office of the junior Senator from Arkansas. As you enter you see a collection of photographs, autographed by a President from Texas: "To BILL FULBRIGHT, who listens, maybe, perhaps; signed, Lyndon B. Johnson," "To BILL: I can see I haven't been very persuasive; signed, Lyndon B. Johnson."

Tonight an examination of the views of J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, who does listen but is not always persuaded.

ANNOUNCER. From Washington, as part of CBS News' continuing coverage of the Vietnam conflict, "FULBRIGHT: Advice and Dissent," a discussion of foreign policy with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as he talks with CBS News Correspondents Eric Sevareid and Martin Agronsky.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, do you feel the course the President is following now in Vietnam is a wise one?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, with respect to the referral to the United Nations, I certainly do, under the circumstances. I think this is the best thing he could do.

I have already expressed my reservations about resuming bombing. I think this is too bad. I wish he had been more patient about resuming bombing. I don't think that helps it. But, any case, he has done that and I don't wish to quarrel about it. I think we have to accept it. But I do approve of going to the United Nations. I know there is much skepticism about it operating, but circumstances have changed since that was last discussed. And I am hopeful, surely, that they will do something in the United Nations.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator FULBRIGHT, you spent a great part of your life studying American foreign policy and the history thereof. We are now suggesting arbitration of this war. Has this country ever agreed before in a war to submit to arbitration by others?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I don't recall it. I must say I wouldn't want to pose as the kind of expert your first statement would pose. I have spent most of my time in public life studying the problems of Arkansas and foreign relations are simply one of my duties. But nevertheless I know of no precedent for that. But I think it is a good one under these circumstances.

It has progressed to the point where we have created the South Vietnamese Government and we are committed to it by reiteration of the word "commitment." I find it very difficult to find any what I call legal commitment through a treaty basis, the

usual kind of commitment, that we have in NATO, for example. I find it very difficult. The explanation that SEATO is the origin of this leaves me very cold. I am very dubious about the validity of these arguments about our commitment. It is a commitment largely by reiteration of the word that we are committed. It is a kind of a self-generating commitment.

But there we are. And, therefore, I have to modify my feeling to the extent that I would like to cooperate in getting out of this. It does me no good, really, to just say we shouldn't have been there. I am trying to explain why there is so much feeling about this that is very unusual under these circumstances.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator, do you feel that what President Johnson has been doing in the last year in Vietnam is inconsistent in line with the so-called commitments of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, President Johnson, in all honesty, inherited this situation. It had become quite substantial when he came onto the scene and he was presented with a very difficult situation. There was as many, as I recall it about 20,000 people of our people there at the time of the Tonkin incident. That is substantial but nothing like now.

I regret that the President ever started the bombing and that much greater effort, this offensive for peace which has just been held—I regret that it wasn't engaged in before we ever became involved. But that is hindsight. I don't wish to be too critical. Goodness knows, that is a difficult job and he did inherit a very difficult situation. And I don't think it is profitable or helpful to be too critical of that period now. And I have to say myself that I have played a part in that that I am not at all proud of, that at the time of the Bay of Tonkin I should have had greater foresight in the consideration of that resolution. That would have been a good time to have precipitated a debate and a reexamination, reevaluation of our involvement. And under the influences that existed then, it was during just the beginning of the presidential campaign.

I was very much a partisan in that campaign for Johnson, for the administration. I disapproved of the statements of Mr. Goldwater and I went along with the urging, I may say, of the administration. I think it is a terrible situation we are in. I am hoping we can find an honorable way out of it. I do not wish to see it escalated into a war. I do not believe in the Secretary's theory that this should be the proper place for a confrontation to destroy forever the idea that the wars of national liberation can succeed. This seems to me not an appropriate place for that. I think that if you are ever going to have it—I hope we don't ever have it. I am not for any confrontation of that sort, by violence. But even if you should have it, this is a very bad place and very bad circumstances. That is why I think this history is significant. We should never have a confrontation where there is any doubt about the justification for our particular part at that time in that particular incident.

Mr. SEVAREID. The Secretary of State, Senator, seems to equate Communist China with Hitler's Germany of the thirties, that is, he feels that this is basically an aggressive force that unless one stops them in the early stage, as in Vietnam now, thinking again of Hitler's course of action, you will end up with a great big war. It will all get out of hand. Do you subscribe to that analogy?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I am afraid I do not. I do not. This is a very complicated situation. In the first place, I think we have come to grossly exaggerate, at least the present power, of China to carry a war beyond her borders. I mean, from the logistical point of view, naval, modern weapons and so on. She has great vast armies and it

would be a terrible mistake to invade her, as the Japanese proved and nearly everyone else has proved, I think, and agrees with that.

I do not equate her with Hitler. China has a history that is quite different. Actually, if you want to go into this, I think the Chinese have every reason to hate the West. I mean the history of Western treatment of China beginning, certainly, with the opium war is the most disgraceful period maybe that I can think of in our history. They have all of these furious feelings, hatred for the West.

What we should be doing is to try to find ways to rectify the terrible wrongs that we and nearly all the other Western countries inflicted on China. This is inbred in them. It reminds me a little bit of the feeling of the South after reconstruction, if I may use an illustration. These things get in people's blood. It takes time to get over it. And the Chinese talk very mad. They are very offensive.

But, coming back to Vietnam, I don't want to be too critical of it. As I say, I have admitted I made the mistake. I wasn't conscious of this. I am no expert on this area and perhaps I have no business talking about it. But you have asked me to come here and talk about it and in my position as chairman, I feel I can't refuse. I don't profess to be any great expert on it. When I am asked to say something I feel I ought to. This is more a feeling than it is an intellectual analysis of all these elements. There is much about this I don't know.

When they say only the President has the information to make a decision, in many respects that is right. But we have to give advice. I think the advice that the Constitution contemplated from us is to reflect the common man's feeling about what he does know about these things. My instinct is that the great United States, this enormous powerful country, becoming involved on the basis we did here, and taking it out on a little country of—whatever it is, 14 million people—to prove some vast point of the success of the Communist plot, as they call it, is not very becoming to us. If we want to confront, if we really are confronting China, if this is really a threat, why don't we attack China or Russia and have it out with someone our own size?

Mr. AGRONSKY. You certainly don't advocate that.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do not, of course I don't. I don't even advocate attacking North Vietnam. I don't at all. I think the whole purport of our policy should be the other way. I think we should try to find—because we can afford this. This business of our prestige to me doesn't appeal at all. If any country could ever afford to withdraw, we will say, or to mediate or conciliate—reconciling in this case, we can. Nobody is going to think we are a paper tiger because we make a settlement here. After all, Russians have withdrawn in several instances, and nobody thought they were no longer of any account in the war, that they are paper tigers, as they say.

I don't know all the circumstances. They withdrew. They got out of Austria after a long travail. Then they got out of Azerbaijan. They got out of Cuba. Why didn't they stand up and say our prestige is involved. These Americans can't push us around and, by gad, we will have it out. I am glad they did. I think they were wrong in going there. But this has some bearing on it. The United States isn't going to lose—on the contrary, I think we would gain a lot of stature if we were wise and magnanimous in seeking a settlement of this and I hope it will come out of the United Nations.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, the whole thrust of your observation seems to be that we haven't been sincerely seeking a settlement. Do you feel that we have been hypocritical about that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, you don't want me to make personal comments about our officials—I don't think that is a proper question for me to say—hypocritical, I question the wisdom and I think this is legitimate always. I mean as a representative of the people of Arkansas, it is my duty, with what little information and judgment I have, to try to use it. And I do question the judgment in this instance. And I think we were misled by this preoccupation with what has been called so often the international conspiracy of communism. And many people still use this, completely ignoring the split between the various countries. They say that is not true. It is just a trick, to trick us and to mislead us. And we have much of that left. And I don't minimize the danger of a country like Russia. The eventual danger—China. And now is the time to try to get this back on the tracks so that when China does become a very powerful country with capacity for aggression beyond her borders, she won't still be of the disposition to do so. That ought to be our objective.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator, you say you are questioning only the wisdom of these policies, but you have questioned more than that in the past. You have said in connection with the Dominican intervention that the Government has not been candid with the American people, they haven't come clean with us.

Senator MORSE said the other day that if the files of your Foreign Relations Committee were opened, people would be surprised at what they had, I assume, not been told. How do you feel about this?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, first these are two different ones. I don't want to get generalizing too much. In the case of the Dominican Republic, I think it is very clear that there was a difference in the announced objective of the intervention and the real objective of the intervention. That is the closest that I can think of, being of a diversion between the fact and the stated fact.

In the case of the briefings that have taken place over the years with regard to Vietnam, my best guess is that those who briefed us erroneously were themselves misled and didn't understand the situation. I mean I cannot believe that people like McNamara, who is one of the principal briefers, and Taylor—he is a man I think of the highest integrity. I wouldn't for a moment insinuate that they would try to mislead us. I don't think so. I think they are very fine men. I mean, and I have the greatest respect for them. And I think that for reasons I don't quite understand, what they told us about the situation, the progress of the war did not turn out to be accurate.

Mr. SEVAREID. But, Senator, this raises a very serious kind of permanent question of how our administration actions and conclusions on the facts of any moment to be doublechecked. Maybe the press has failed. You have come in well after the fact on the Dominican Republic and said it was wrong. You have come along now, 18 months after the resolution of the Tonkin Gulf and said that shouldn't have been done that way.

Is there a way that the Senate, for example, can be in at the takeoff—

Senator FULBRIGHT. There is no possible way for the Senate—we can't have a department of our own, a CIA of our own, and all of them. We have six overworked professional staff members on my committee and we have always traditionally relied upon the administration and I think we always will. I don't think it is feasible to do this. And our function isn't to duplicate the State Department and the CIA.

You will recall that there was a great outcry by the administration against certain journalists in Vietnam, saying they were misleading the public.

Well, the journalists proved to be right, I think, by the course of events. The same way in Vietnam—in the Dominican Republic. In my view many of the reports that took place by journalists proved to be more accurate than some of the official reports. I don't know how this happens. Or why.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, what is the advice of the Senate if it is always well after the fact then too late. Then what is wrong with the mechanism.

Senator FULBRIGHT. It isn't much good, I don't think. In many cases we usually go along with the administration, as a say, as a kind of general consensus of the people, I suppose. I can't recall many great contributions made to the foreign policy of this country. I can recall the Senate's action on the League of Nations, which I think was a disaster. And they don't always do right and I may not be correct in my judgment, either. I try to be restrained about it.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Let's pause for a moment and resume the questioning after this message.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator FULBRIGHT, North Vietnam has declared today that it will consider any resolutions of the U.N. Security Council and Vietnam is invalid and it insists that we must go back to the 1954 Geneva Conventions.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, as a matter of fact I have suggested, as others, that the reconvening of the Geneva Conference under the chairmanship of Great Britain and Russia would be an appropriate way to approach this matter. President Johnson has from time to time stated the Geneva Accords was the basis for negotiation, the starting place, at least, to see if we could reach a settlement. So that if that is the way they wish it and they are willing to participate and the chairmen are willing to call it, this would seem to me to be a very good recommendation of the Security Council.

The Security Council, as I understand it, has sort of a free rein to recommend whatever they think might bring these parties together and have a negotiation. So I would see nothing wrong with that. I regret that they refused to come to the U.N. I would prefer now that it has been started that they come to the U.N. and make their own case even if that is the result. But I think it is terrible that they are so contemptuous of the U.N.

I don't approve of that at all. But we are dealing with a fact and if this is the only way to get it, I see nothing particularly wrong because this has been advocated—in fact, we urged the calling, the reconvening of it. And the British, I think, proposed it and I think the Russians refused. This was a year or two ago, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You have repeatedly called for the involvement of the Vietcong. Do you think they should be involved in this instance again?

Senator FULBRIGHT. It would seem to me that this is a purely practical matter, not a theoretical one. They are the army in being. We are told they have somewhere in the neighborhood of 236,000 to 250,000 men which is the corps of the fighting in South Vietnam—so to speak, against the regime which we support, the Ky regime. I would think that they are a proper party to a negotiation because you negotiate over their heads and you arrive at agreements, if they are not involved why they can keep on fighting. And this could be a futile thing.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And you feel that we must accept the Vietcong participation in this thing?

Senator FULBRIGHT. It strikes me that it is necessary because they are the boys doing the fighting. They have the guns, they are

killing our people and that is what you want to stop. If you have a ceasefire, who do you have the ceasefire with? You have it with Hanoi or do you have it with the Vietcong. Who is directly—the theory of the administration seems to be that Hanoi absolutely controls it all. I am not sure that this is clear, that these people that are doing the fighting in the field, I am sure they are allied with them, they are taking advice and orders from General Diem because he is the superior kind of director. But they also have a being of their own. They have representatives abroad. It could well be these people, having tasted some degree of control of their own affairs might like it and they might like to—in fact it might be wise to try to develop a little more division between the Vietcong and Hanoi. I think it might serve our purposes.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator, the Russians apparently are moving into North Vietnam a little more all the time. Much talk of their putting in sophisticated weapons. They seem to want to get in a position politically between the Chinese and Ho Chi Minh's regime, to become the dominant foreign influence with Hanoi. Isn't it possible that as enough time goes by this war is still in, that settlement really is going to be made between us and the Soviet Union?

Senator FULBRIGHT. They ought to be involved. They are a great power in that area, not only that area but the world, and I think they ought to be involved. And, therefore, I am very much in favor of that. I think it would be a good thing. My guess is—and it is purely a guess, of course—on balance they would rather like to see this settled before it gets out of hand. Why else did they become—inject themselves apparently successfully in the controversy between Pakistan and India. This was, some of our best advisers in professional standards, said that was utterly impossible that the Russians could do anything. It was just a propaganda gesture. But it worked.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator FULBRIGHT, the Secretary of State has said recently that he thinks the world on the whole is further away from the danger of nuclear war than it has been in the past. I take it you don't agree with that.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I don't think human nature has gone through any great change in recent years. I think we are subject to many of the same ills that has afflicted us from the beginning. It is going to take a very major and persistent effort on the part of wise leaders to make a change in these—in the kind of instinct feelings, emotions and so on that have resulted in war before. This is why I have had such great hopes that our country, with this unprecedented economic power, physical power, invulnerable in the sense insofar as you can, except now the nuclear weapons, to so many things that afflicted other countries.

There are no real ambitions for imperialism, although we are accused of it. We might play a real leading role in changing the course of events that lead periodically to these wars. But I don't see any ground for the optimism that you indicate. I didn't know the Secretary thought that. He didn't evidence great optimism before my committee the other day and I didn't realize he felt we were in a much better state than before.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Might the optimism not derive from the Secretary from his feeling that the Russians also want peace?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I don't know. I don't recall his having stated that. I really can't read the mind of the Secretary of State. I think I am not a very good authority there.

Mr. SEVAREID. Isn't it generally true, Senator, that people responsible for the conduct of policy, like the President or the Secretary

of State, just cannot afford the luxury of public pessimism?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I don't know about that. You see it seems to me that we would all get along better if we say what we think, whether it is pessimistic or optimistic. And I mentioned a moment ago that this thing troubles me about prestige and the nations have always been afflicted with saving face. I can see how a little country which is on the make and hasn't much to support it must be very conscious of its dignity and so on and so on. But our country, it seems to me, can afford to be ungracious, for a small country cannot afford to, maybe in the eyes of the world. And it is—because we could do things that no other country could do without people thinking we were degenerate or soft or weak or all that sort of thing.

We wouldn't lose faith, in my opinion. We would gain face, in my opinion, if we would act wisely and magnanimously and generously in these situations because we can afford it.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator FULBRIGHT, I think we have come to the end of our allotted time here. You have been very patient, very responsive. We would both like to thank you very much.

* * * * *

ANNOUNCER. FULBRIGHT: Advice and Discernment was part of CBS News' continuing coverage of the Vietnam conflict.

This program was prerecorded and edited under the supervision and control of CBS News.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77), to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, earlier today, immediately following the morning hour, a motion was made by my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to permit that committee to meet next Friday while the Senate is in session.

I do not believe that it would be a violation of the rule of germaneness for me to make brief comment upon why I voted on that issue as I did.

The issue before the Senate at this hour is a motion to take up a particular measure for consideration. That motion is opposed. I am one of those who oppose the motion. I oppose the motion for many reasons. One of those reasons—and it is sufficient within itself—is that there is vastly more important legislation that the Senate should be considering at this time.

I submit that anything whether appropriations, authorization legislation, or simply information afforded to Congress and to the public as to the true conditions and the problems that we face in Vietnam is far more important than the bill that is now sought to be taken up for consideration by the Senate. The

Vietnam situation is far more important and certainly should be given precedence over the pending matter.

I felt that the Committee on Foreign Relations should be given the opportunity to meet while the Senate was in session. I would not make that concession to all committees. I believe that many things can well be deferred until this issue is settled. However, the Committee on Appropriations is meeting to consider a request by the President for an appropriation with which to finance the war. The Committee on Armed Services is meeting, by consent of the Senate, to consider authorization legislation that may be necessary upon which to premise the requested appropriations.

I believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations should be permitted to meet. I am not offended because the motion was rejected. I merely want to clarify my position. While I oppose taking up the proposed measure, I would not knowingly oppose, either on the floor or anywhere else, any functioning of the Senate with relation to the war effort which could contribute either to a victory in that war or which could make a contribution to the bringing of the issue to a conference table so that negotiations could be pursued and an honorable settlement and peace could possibly be obtained.

The issue before the Senate has no relation on earth to the war effort, none whatsoever. It is completely foreign to it.

The general impression is, and I have not heard anybody deny it, that this bill is here merely to keep faith with a political promise made during the last election.

It has been claimed that we are attempting to enact the legislation in order to pay a political debt. I do not know anything about that. If such an obligation was incurred by anyone during the last campaign, or before or since, I am not a party to the agreement. I am not bound by it, and I am under no obligation whatsoever to anyone to perform any duty in keeping with any such commitment that might have been made.

I am here today free from any such obligation, free as I want the laboring people of this country to be—and particularly those laboring people in my State—free to join a union if they chose to do so, or to decline to join if they do not want to belong to a union.

I stated in my previous remarks that I believe in the position I am taking and that I am representing a great majority of the citizens of Arkansas whom I have the honor to represent.

I am confident that I represent a great majority of the laboring people of my State, the workers in industry, and the nonagricultural laborers in my State.

Ever since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935—which I supported while a Representative—workers in industry and workers for wages and salaries throughout the land have had an opportunity to join a union if they wished to do so.

Not only have they the opportunity, Mr. President, but hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended by labor

organizations trying to persuade and induce them to join the unions. Notwithstanding such efforts, a great majority of the workers in my State have declined to do so. So I think I am representing their viewpoint. I do not believe anyone who has declined to join a union would want me to vote for a law to make him join a union, and therefore I shall not do so.

A while ago I heard the minority leader quote some poll statistics. I do not remember the exact figures. I am not familiar with those polls, and would not undertake to say how reliable they are. But if I remember correctly, he said that some poll showed that 65 percent of the American people oppose this compulsory unionism measure. I believe he said another poll showed that some 44 percent of union members throughout the country opposed it, and an even larger percentage of the wives of union members opposed it.

Mr. President, I do not know whether such polls are accurate. If they are, we are undertaking to do something here that a majority of the American people do not wish us to do. I shall not undertake to speak for a majority of the American people, but I do say that I speak for a majority of the citizens of my State. I say that again, Mr. President, because my State, by popular ballot, adopted a constitutional amendment embracing the right to work—the right to work without joining a union—and prohibiting an employer from discharging someone or refusing him employment merely because he belonged to a union. In other words, we in Arkansas have taken the middle course. We are fair to both sides. We have left the decision to the man who works.

That constitutional amendment was adopted since I came to the Senate. I believe it was adopted in 1944. A few years later, as I recall, an effort was made to repeal it by referendum. That referendum, by vote of the people, was rejected. They declined to repeal that provision.

Last year, while the Arkansas Legislature was in session, it passed resolutions entreating the Members of this Congress from Arkansas to vote against the pending measure.

Mr. President, so far as I know, every sign, every test, in Arkansas, indicates that the people do not want their constitution changed. It indicates that they are unwilling to change it; and as I said in previous remarks, I shall not do here to them, at the behest of the labor leaders of my State, what they are unwilling to do, nor shall I do here that which is contrary to what they have done. I repeat that it is unfair for the labor leaders of my State to ask me, or any other member of the Arkansas delegation, to vote to repeal this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It is unfair because they have a remedy. The unions can, in the next election—this year, in November—by petition—and they have enough members in Arkansas to sign such a petition if their members want it—again have this constitutional amendment referred to a vote of the people. They elected not to

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I point out to the Senate that if the Senate agrees to this motion, any Senator can come forward with a resolution providing that certain committees shall be entitled to meet during the Senate's sessions, and then recite every one of the standing, joint, special, and subcommittees of the Senate—and there are 107 of them. Then violence will have been done to rule, and it will be thrown out the window.

If the Senate sets this precedent, it will rue the day it does it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for 1 minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of that, while Senators are in the Chamber, I wish now to state that I will call a meeting in the morning of the committee at 9:30, to consider procedural matters, and that if the committee is willing, I will then try to make plans to have a meeting outside the hours, the Senate would be in session beginning next week; but, I believe that we might as well vote on this question now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to lay the pending motion on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to lay on the table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT.]

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the

Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 23 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Allott	Harris	Pearson
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Bass	Holland	Proxmire
Bayh	Hruska	Robertson
Bennett	Inouye	Saltanostall
Bible	Jackson	Scott
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Stennis
Cannon	Magnuson	Thurmond
Carlson	Mansfield	Tower
Cotton	McGee	Tydings
Curtis	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Montoya	Yarborough
Douglas	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Murphy	
Fannin	Muskie	

NAYS—31

Aiken	Gruening	Moss
Bartlett	Hart	Nelson
Case	Hartke	Pastore
Church	Javits	Randolph
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Lausche	Russell, Ga.
Dodd	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Fong	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Mondale	
Gore	Morse	

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Neuberger
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Pell
Ellender	McNamara	Russell, S.C.
Hayden	Miller	Smathers
Hill	Monroney	Talmadge
Jordan, N.C.	Morton	

So the motion of Mr. LONG of Louisiana to lay on the table the motion of Mr. FULBRIGHT was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the pending question.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York on the same terms to those I previously yielded to other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized.

PRESIDENT'S NEW FOREIGN AID PROGRAM INADEQUATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the President's message to the Congress on foreign aid and his message today on international health and education.

The foreign aid message reveals a deep cleavage and ambivalence between the President's deep concern with the many problems of developing nations and the programs he asked Congress to approve. If the President expects adequately to cope with these problems he has the responsibility to present to Congress and the American people a program that will meet these needs—even if it involves great new burdens. His foreign aid message fails completely in that respect.

The principal failure of the U.S. economic aid program is that the total impact terms of public and private capital is vastly below the requirements of developing nations for development capital. This is a failure in terms of inadequate government assistance, inadequate incentives to encourage the flow of private capital to developing countries, and inadequate economic aid contributions obtained from other industrialized countries through the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

The gap between nations in the developing status and nations in the developed status is not narrowing but widening. We are not being told how it is to be closed. This is the greatest barrier to world peace and security that we face.

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid in its report of August 25, 1965, estimated the "gap" between developing countries' needs for capital and what they are likely to get from all sources at between \$5 billion and

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

- | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Allott | Hartke | Pearson |
| Anderson | Hickenlooper | Prouty |
| Bayh | Holland | Randolph |
| Boggs | Hruska | Robertson |
| Byrd, Va. | Inouye | Russell, Ga. |
| Cannon | Jordan, Idaho | Saltonstall |
| Carlson | Kennedy, Mass. | Scott |
| Case | Lausche | Simpson |
| Cotton | Magnuson | Smith |
| Curtis | McCarthy | Sparkman |
| Dodd | McGee | Stennis |
| Dominick | McGovern | Symington |
| Douglas | McIntyre | Thurmond |
| Eastland | Metcalf | Tydings |
| Ervin | Montoya | Williams, N.J. |
| Fannin | Moss | Williams, Del. |
| Fong | Mundt | Yarborough |
| Gruening | Murphy | Young, N. Dak. |
| Harris | Nelson | Young, Ohio |
| Hart | Pastore | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President—
Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. The Senator from Arkansas—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has moved—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order so that Senators may understand what is being said?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has moved that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet while the Senate is in session on Friday. A unanimous-consent request was made to that effect during the morning hour, and it was objected to.

So far as I am concerned, I should be happy to have the committee meet, and pleased to have the unanimous-consent request granted. But, Mr. President, I know a dilatory motion when I hear one.

We are now attempting to get H.R. 77 before the Senate upon a motion to proceed. Senators who wish to oppose that motion are entitled to two speeches during any one legislative day. A number of such speeches have now been made. If this motion for the Foreign Relations Committee to be permitted to meet is permitted to come before the Senate, it is a debatable motion, and every Senator can make two speeches on it. Furthermore, such a motion is subject to amendment, which is not exactly the case with a motion to proceed. Therefore, every Senator would be entitled to offer amendments. There is no assurance whatever, if this motion that the Foreign Relations Committee be permitted to meet on Friday is permitted to displace the pending business, that the Sen-

ate will agree to the motion before Friday, because the motion is debatable as well as subject to amendment; and such procedures could consume the time of the Senate until next Monday or the end of next week—merely debating whether a committee is to be permitted to meet.

Mr. President, the leadership will cooperate with the Senator from Arkansas. If it must be done, the Senate will recess so that his committee can be called together.

But, Mr. President, if this debatable motion is permitted to displace the motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77, we might as well forget about the whole thing, and lay 14(b) aside; because other motions of similar merit can be made, and the end result will be that we shall spend all our time debating whether committees should meet, rather than hearing the speeches which must be heard before we finally come to a vote on the motion to make the consideration of H.R. 77 the pending business of the Senate.

(The VICE PRESIDENT assumed the chair at this point.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas for 3 minutes, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not make this as a dilatory motion. All I want is permission for my committee to meet.

There have been suggestions that we could arrange to have meetings after hours; but I would like to have one meeting of the committee at least to consider the procedure, and to make arrangements for meetings after hours, if we are not to be permitted to meet while the Senate is in session.

If the Senator from Louisiana thinks this motion is dilatory in nature, would he entertain a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote within 10 minutes after the motion is stated, or that we have at least 10 minutes to discuss the reason for it?

There is confusion about this question. If Senators vote to permit the committee to meet on Friday, there is nothing dilatory about that, if we can get it to a vote. All the Senator from Arkansas is worried about is getting it to a vote within a reasonable time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us find out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas be limited to 5 minutes, with the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the only simple question upon which I seek a vote is, May my Committee on Foreign Relations meet 1 day, on Friday?

The Appropriations Committee is meeting today and every day, as is the Armed Services Committee. I am asking for nothing but a 1-day meeting, and that is all.

I do not wish to delay the consideration of H.R. 77 on this ground; I wish to delay it upon its own merits, and I propose to do so. I do not need to delay it by means of this motion. That was not my motive in making it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the majority leader, and we agree that we will find a way for the Foreign Relations Committee to meet, notwithstanding the objections which have been made, to consider the vital matters pending before it, and we will cooperate and work with the Senator from Arkansas to that effect.

We will cooperate with the Senator, of course, to that effect. How we will do it, I do not know. I hope that the Senator will withdraw his motion. If he does not, I am compelled to insist on moving to lay it on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I wish to announce now, whether this question is voted on or not, that I intend to call a committee meeting at 9:30 in the morning, to consider certain procedural matters; but I should like to have a meeting next Friday to hear David Bell and get the matter of the supplemental appropriation underway. I am sitting here and everyone is blaming me for doing it, but they do not understand that my committee cannot meet because of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the only suggestion I could make would be that the Committee on Foreign Relations meet at 8 o'clock in the morning. It appears to me that that would give them time to get started. If the members are given sufficient notice, they will be present. But, certainly, we cannot set aside section 14 (b). There has been too much going on in the way of dilatory tactics in laying this measure before the Senate. I do not, of course, attribute any dilatory tactics to the Senator from Arkansas. He is really desirous of trying to conform to the wishes of the administration. I would assume that those who are opposed to committee meetings know that a matter such as Vietnam should be considered, and that is what the chairman of the committee is trying to do. But, so far as section 14(b) is concerned, it will not be set aside until it is disposed of one way or the other. The only suggestion I can make would be for the committee to meet earlier, before the Senate meets, or to meet late in the evening after the Senate has recessed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to table the motion—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his motion?

\$20 billion annually. The United States is on record in full support of the United Nations goal of having each industrialized country make available for development assistance the equivalent of 1 percent of its gross national product. In 1964, this would have amounted to total U.S. economic assistance to developing nations of \$5.8 billion, or 25 percent above the actual level; and in 1966, over \$7 billion or about twice what the President is asking for. In contrast, the net flow of public long-term U.S. capital to developing nations in 1964 totaled \$3.3 billion. Net long-term private U.S. capital to developing countries that year totaled \$1.3 billion.

The remedy is twofold: a drastic shift toward private sector participation in foreign aid and a major increase in U.S. governmental aid. We are failing to meet our obligations on both counts. This is clear whether we use the Watson committee's estimate of the "gap" or our pledge under the 1960 U.N. "decade of development" resolution.

I particularly regret the lack of emphasis on private enterprise cooperation in the foreign aid message. The report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, which resulted from my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, has been filed 5 months ago, yet I see little evidence in the message that the recommendations of that distinguished committee have yet been implemented. The President states that many of the committee's recommendations are now being put into effect. On January 17 I requested David Bell, Administrator of AID, to advise me the extent to which the Watson Committee's recommendations have been implemented. Congress has every right to get a full accounting on that score before it approves any aspect of the administration's foreign aid program. A shift towards the maximum involvement of private enterprise is, in my opinion, as vital as the 5-year authorization for economic and military aid requested by the President or the separation of requests for economic aid from military assistance.

Funds provided for economic and social development in Vietnam reflect the continued failure of the administration to accord as high a priority to the social, political, and economic aspect of the Vietnam struggle as to the military aspects. The resolution of social and economic questions will, in the long run, determine whether or not freedom really wins out in Vietnam. For fiscal year 1967 the President is requesting \$648 million in economic aid including \$98 million for Public Law 480 assistance.

In addition, substantial portion of \$100 million requested on January 19 for the contingency fund in the fiscal year 1966 supplemental, may be available for unforeseen requirements in Vietnam, including economic. While this represents a substantial increase over his original request for fiscal year 1966—\$330 million, including \$64 million for Public Law 480—it is dwarfed by his request for \$10 billion to wage the military struggle in Vietnam.

There are many features in the President's message, however, which deserve support:

I favor the President's determination to relate U.S. economic aid to self-help performance of aid recipient.

I am also pleased with the administration's strong support for regional and multinational approach to economic development in Latin America, as elsewhere. The staggering problems of developing nations cannot be solved without such an approach.

I favor the increased emphasis on strengthening less developed countries' ability to raise their educational and health standards and to increase their agricultural output. The President's message on international health should serve to spark programs contemplated and authorized by the International Health Research Act—Public Law 86-610—signed into law by President Eisenhower on July 12, 1960.

A program for international health can be an effective program for peace, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his 1958 state of the Union message. At that time he advocated pooling U.S. efforts with Soviet efforts to eradicate the diseases which have so long scourged mankind. President Johnson's message on international health should serve as an occasion to revive—and even expand—the Eisenhower proposal as part of the U.S. effort toward peace and international understanding.

The President's proposals on international education further a long-time U.S. policy of cementing international goodwill through knowledge, a policy which dates back to the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt when the United States accepted college scholarships for young Chinese students as its settlement for Boxer Rebellion damages.

However, the President's program is incomplete. I refer particularly to my proposal contained in S. 2037 to amend the National Defense Education Act to strengthen American educational institutions in the area of international affairs studies. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, in a letter to me on August 2 of last year, characterized this proposal as correctly identifying "needs in certain areas of international education." It is

my intention to seek to amend the administration proposal to include the provisions of S. 2037.

Another omission from the administration proposal appears to be a provision for adequately aiding American students who wish to attend foreign schools with loans. For example, despite the shortage of doctors in this Nation, young Americans studying abroad cannot avail themselves of the benefits available under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Veterans pursuing studies in foreign universities could avail themselves of GI bill benefits. We must find the means to assist the foreign study of other young Americans by making available to them, where possible, the benefits of student aid programs now available for domestic study only.

Much of this new emphasis on raising international health and education standards will go to waste unless the less developed countries will also raise their ability to control their population explosion. We must do all we can—and not only pay lip service—to enable recipient countries to deal with this, their fundamental problem, in a decisive manner.

In conclusion, the President has offered great plans but he is not giving the American people the program to meet those plans, yet it is well within our competence to do so.

The way we are going to really win in Vietnam is by winning over people in terms of education, health, and housing in order to give them a vested stake in what we are trying to accomplish in Vietnam. Even purely on the basis of national security grounds, it is worth our doing so as we juxtapose the amounts we are spending for war purposes in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a table indicating our economic assistance to Vietnam in fiscal year 1967 and two previous fiscal years, as well as two editorials from the New York Times and one editorial from the Washington Post on the new foreign aid program may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. economic aid to Vietnam

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966			Fiscal year 1967 request
		Original request	Supplemental request	Total	
A. Economic assistance	283.2	266.1	127.5	541.1	2550.0
1. Supporting assistance	216.4	200.0	27.5	475.0	560.0
2. Development grants	8.5	10.6		10.6	
3. Southeast Asia contingency funds (Vietnam)		55.5		55.5	
B. Public Law 480	58.3	64.0	31	95.0	98.1
C. Total	341.5	330.1	306	636.1	648.1

¹ In addition as part of his supplemental request, the President is asking for \$100,000,000 for contingency fund, mostly on account of Vietnam.
² Development grants included.

Source: Agency for International Development.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]

FALSE ECONOMY ON AID

The Johnson administration's report on foreign aid makes the point that its \$3.5-billion program is in line shape. The only trouble is that its beneficiaries, the developing countries, are worse off than ever.

Under Mr. Johnson, the foreign-aid program has been drastically revised. It is more streamlined and more efficient. As the President himself noted, it has shifted from "simply helping other countries to stay afloat to helping them become more self-supporting," which indicates that the developing countries have reached a new stage from which they can take off.

This may be true for a limited number of countries—for Formosa, Israel and Spain. But it is still a dream for most. The fact is that conditions have deteriorated almost everywhere. The developing countries are burdened with huge debts and soaring interest rate payments. They are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain living standards, much less to increase them. In India, in Africa and in much of Latin America, rapidly growing populations are outpacing the available supplies of food. The poor nations, as George D. Woods of the World Bank has pointed out, are falling further behind the rich and generating new and dangerously explosive tensions as their aspirations are frustrated.

The aid program is not dealing with these problems. It has been given a new look that is mainly designed to correct some of the mistakes of the past. But those mistakes are now being compounded by the very inadequacy of the program. At a time when the poor countries are sorely in need of increased assistance, the United States has whittled down its help to a mere one-half of 1 percent of the Nation's total output of goods and services, which is a fraction of what was spent when the Nation was far less prosperous. And the amount of economic assistance accounted for just \$2.1 billion, with the remainder taking the form of military aid.

Admittedly, aid is now administered more efficiently. There is less waste and extravagance, so that it is possible to get more for every dollar spent. But as this is the case, the administration should not be thinking of retrenchment and trying to convince itself that the developing world is getting just about all the help that it can make use of.

The fact is that the developing world can use a great deal more money and food and technical assistance. It needs help from all of the rich countries, and not only the United States. But if the President means to cope with political unrest, potential famine and other problems that cause him "deep concern," then he faces the necessity of mounting a more effective and expansive aid program, something considerably bigger than the present minimal effort.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1966]

REFORMS IN FOREIGN AID

President Johnson's message to Congress embraces two long overdue reforms in the handling of American foreign aid legislation. He has agreed to separate economic from military assistance and to ask the Congress for 5-year authorizations in both categories, instead of leaving the programs largely on a year-to-year basis.

In these matters, as in his emphasis in the annual foreign aid message on working through international agencies, Mr. Johnson at last has adopted the recommendations of Senator J. W. Fulbright—a belated if indirect tribute to the wisdom of the Foreign Relations Committee chairman.

The President's message cites humanitarian American goals for the less fortunate of the world with warmth. But he also calls for an attack on "the root causes of pov-

erty," rather than just another relief program. And he emphasizes bluntly the necessity for self-help by the recipient countries, beginning with "hard, unremitting, often thankless, work," and ranging from drastic agricultural reforms to strict birth control.

Mr. Johnson seeks to boost agricultural aid by more than a third, educational aid by a half, and health assistance by two-thirds—recommendations reflecting the advice of experts on social and economic growth in the developing countries. He clearly recognizes that United Nations and other international organizations can often assist economic development more effectively and with less political friction than can the United States acting on its own, and he renews American pledges of support for the worthy goals of regional development and economic integration.

But, as usual, there is one thing basically wrong with the foreign aid program: It is not large enough. The \$2.5 billion requested for economic assistance for next year would be only marginally bigger than the amount Congress authorized for this fiscal year. Mr. Johnson is asking for only about one-half of 1 percent of America's burgeoning gross national product, far less than this Nation provided when it was far less prosperous.

It is one of the most ominous facts about our world that over the last 5 years economic conditions have deteriorated in many poorer countries while the rich ones got richer. Mr. Johnson's third straight "pre-shrunk" foreign aid request may be the maximum Congress would tolerate, but it is not enough to fulfill the American share of a task vital to long-run hopes for world peace and stability.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1966]

FOREIGN AID

The somber backdrop against which our foreign aid program must be measured has been drawn for us by World Bank President George D. Woods. Per capita income in the United States, writes Woods in the current Foreign Affairs, will spiral from its present level of \$3,000 per year to \$4,500 by the end of the century if it continues to grow at current rates; in the 40 poorest developing countries, by contrast, the figure will go at best from \$120 to \$170 per year.

Warning that the "development decade" launched by the late President Kennedy may become a "decade of disappointment," Woods deplors the "relatively low place that development finance has hitherto been accorded in their list of priorities" by the industrial nations. Woods finds the developing countries "growing in their ability to carry out investment." He cites a Bank study showing that "the developing countries could put to constructive use, over the next 5 years, some \$3 to \$4 billion more each year than is currently being made available to them." And he urges Western statesmen to press for more loan capital on better terms.

President Johnson, in his foreign aid message, has now given his response to the appeal by the World Bank president, and it can only be described as a stunning rebuff. The President makes scarcely a passing gesture to the foreign exchange needs of the developing countries and the importance of expanding U.S. development lending. Far from conceding the need for an increased capital flow, he strongly implies that U.S. development loans will be kept at present levels—or reduced—while the country launches instead on the "daring new direction" of programs—mainly technical assistance—for the improvement of health, education, and agriculture. The "lesson of the past," as the President sees it is that the United States must remain on guard lest it "subsidize those who do not assume re-

sponsibility for their own fate." While recognizing "the shortsightedness of isolation," he declares, "we do not embrace the equally futile prospect of total and endless dependence."

It has perhaps been inevitable that a U.S. President would eventually throw up his hands in impatience and exasperation after so many years of aid and so little evidence that the intractable problems of food deficits and runaway population growth are near a solution. Year after year, aid budgets have been oversold with glittering promises of an early "takeoff" which have had little relation to the enormity of the development challenge. Yet viewed in perspective, as Woods makes clear, the aid programs of the United States and the international agencies have failed to achieve a breakthrough in part, at least, because they have been far too small in the light of the size of the problem. In striking out on new paths, therefore, the President should make unmistakably clear that he is not simply turning away from the costly road of increased development lending.

The President is clearly giving important new world leadership in focusing attention on the population problem and on the need for more urgent action to bring population and food resources into balance. His separate message on food aid policy will be awaited with keen interest. In themselves, the President's modest increases in the aid budget of \$125 million for agricultural development, \$67 million for education abroad and \$60 million in the health field are all welcome improvements in the aid field. Regrettably, however, these promising new departures have been achieved not as part of an overall budgetary increase but rather at the expense of development lending.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me on the same understanding that he does not lose his right to the floor and the remainder of the conditions he stated previously?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I may have unanimous consent, I so yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his courtesy.

As regards the senior Senator from New York, I have been immensely gratified with his recent statements expressing his support of the course taken by the Commander in Chief of Vietnam.

I know that he has done this notwithstanding the fact that there may be some dissent in his constituency, as there is in mine on this matter.

I wish to congratulate him for the courage he has shown in taking the position which he has.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I can thank the Senator?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much. I think very highly of the Senator and his views and his concurrence in these ideas is deeply gratifying.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator. The President must surely be gratified with the stand taken by the loyal opposition which sharply contrasts with that taken by his nonsupporters so noticeable on the other side of the aisle both here and in the other body.

Mr. President, the President once again seeks to resolve the Vietnamese crisis by calling on Ambassador Arthur Goldberg

general search for peace, such as the United States has already, informally, asked the U.N. to undertake. This would include a conference, with the objective of applying the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 (the latter concerned Laos) and of setting up and supervising a cease-fire. Composition of the conference is not spelled out; the door remains open for mediation or arbitration, as suggested by Pope Paul.

The effect of such a resolution would bring pressure upon the Soviet Union to do what it has thus far refused to do—sponsor another session of the Geneva conference. It would also, if adopted (or even if accepted by a majority and lost through a Soviet veto) furnish Security Council support for American peace efforts. And in any case, by accompanying the bombs with a resolution, President Johnson dramatizes anew the American position: to fight if necessary; to negotiate if possible.

Resumption of Bombings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep disappointment and regret that President Johnson felt it necessary this week to resume the bombings in North Vietnam.

Some time ago I joined with several of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in voicing to the President our considered thought on this vitally important subject. In our letter, we enthusiastically endorsed the month-long bombing pause over North Vietnam as an imaginative and integral part in the President's worldwide diplomatic peace offensive.

Specifically, we declared:

While the response from the other side has not been encouraging, we do not believe we should yet assume that the door has been firmly closed. We cannot expect that a conflict which has raged so bitterly for so long will be quickly or easily resolved. Neither can we ignore the alternative to negotiations, a prolonged and probably expanded war with attendant costs in human suffering and material resources. * * * We recognize that there are those who urge a resumption of bombings of North Vietnam and a premature abandonment of our peace efforts. We are, however, concerned that unless we can halt or reverse the escalation of the last months it will become increasingly difficult to achieve a further pause, a cease-fire, and meaningful negotiations. We urge you, therefore, to continue your present determined search for peace until such time as it becomes clear that no reasonable hope remains for a just settlement by peaceful means.

Because of the great danger of continued escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia, I had joined in the hopes and prayers of millions of Americans that it would not be necessary to resume the aerial bombings in the North.

It was our fervent desire that the initial pause could be followed by a more general reduction in hostilities both on the ground and in the air—in the south as well as in the north—and that the

other side would join us in such a de facto deescalation of the fighting, which in turn could lead to some kind of cease-fire with unconditional discussions of the overall problems of peace in that entire area.

Certainly, the President is to be congratulated on his decision to bring the situation in Vietnam before the United Nations as an additional step in his effort to explore every possibility of promoting the cause of peace in that war-torn part of the world.

But it seems to me that it was most unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the President's outstanding effort to enlist the help of the U.N. in finding a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

A Vanishing Breed: The Good Policeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are sinister forces at work throughout the country attempting to undermine basic respect for law and order, which has been one of our fundamental national virtues.

Columnist John Vrtis, writing in the *Suburban Life*, devotes attention to the very crucial question, that of the maintenance of an effective police force by our local communities. His direct comments apply to communities in suburban Cook County, Ill., but the overall question under discussion is pertinent to all areas of the country.

A VANISHING BREED: THE GOOD POLICEMAN

(By John Vrtis)

Unless the trend is reversed almost immediately, the current population in the western suburbs is likely to be smothered by a breakdown of law and order.

With the almost infinite stealth of a burglar, an alarming situation has crept upon us where quality policemen are a vanishing breed.

Examples are legion in Chicagoland and elsewhere, but one of the most dramatic illustrations can be found in Downers Grove where eight positions in the force, over one-fourth of the total complement, will soon be unfilled.

Five patrolman positions have been open since January 1, 1965, a sergeant left in November, a patrolman left this month, and another officer has tendered a resignation which becomes effective this week.

There may have been others who have left, but it is kind of hard to keep track of departures from a given police force these days.

Not so with the comings. Not one policeman has joined the Downers Grove force since January 1, 1965, and this situation is not unusual elsewhere.

Why? There is the irritating, but minor, case of a village police and fire commission which refused to publicize a recent civil service test for police candidates beyond the legal minimum, despite an obvious need.

The principal causes, however, extend far beyond shortsighted officials and touch each of us. Even in today's courts, few of us could escape indictment on at least one of the following six charges.

(1) Respect for law and order is out of fashion. Ask any cop and he will tell you that today's youngsters and many adults think more of Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest than of the Ten Commandments. Where once the officer on the corner was like a John Wayne with the kiddies, today he is on a par with Mickey Mouse in meaning, if not in amusement, among members of the "beat" generation.

(2) Court and legislative support for policemen is virtually nonexistent. Volumes could be printed on this, but any conscientious officer has got to be demoralized when many of his best crime-fighting techniques are inadmissible in court; when a single technicality will overturn an "airtight" case; and, where convictions are obtained, see light sentences imposed that can only serve to encourage present and would-be criminals.

It appears that the present stream of legal and legislative decisions protecting rights of individuals is pushing the right of a community to law and order into the gutter as just so much "rubbish." Police state measures can never be permitted under our form of government, but neither can unbridled individual freedom. Some balance between extremes must be sought * * * and found.

(3) Policemen are often more on the defensive than the offensive. Recall last year's unfortunate incident in Chicago where a much decorated officer was put "on the carpet" for defending himself against assault by a prisoner.

Front-page publicity did manage to conjure a stream of protest, but the incident only brought more clearly into focus the erosion of self-respect and authority that once was the hallmark of a police officer.

(4) Policemen are not paid enough. Almost any union man makes more than he does, yet a police officer is called upon to have the wisdom of Solomon, the mercy of Christ, and the courage of a frontline marine.

If the cop ever does anything wrong, he is held up for public ridicule like a Judas, and when he does something right, it usually goes unrecognized until he fails to do it in the future.

Yet all of this time the same cop is packing a gun to protect us and the quality of his performance will surely reflect itself in the community. His low pay does not make sense.

(5) Youngsters are "smart" enough to look upon police efforts to maintain order as a challenge rather than a necessity. Elementary schools, to the extent that they push youngsters to new educational peaks before they have the maturity to wield their knowledge responsibly, share in the blame. Maybe proportionately more time should be "wasted" on teaching youngsters a sense of responsibility.

(6) Parents and adults are failing in their responsibilities. Discipline begins in the home, but where parents abandon their children night and day, or otherwise fail to give them the care and affection they need, it can be no wonder that the kids will grow up with an "independent" mind. Ask any officer how many parents have said to them, "I never thought it would happen to my child." Will you be the next to say it?

Of course, there is no pat answer to the disintegration of respect for law and authority which confronts us, except perhaps if we were to listen more to the pleadings of our ministers and priests.

But it is safe to assert that recognition of the problem and interest in its solution will help. An avalanche can be started by a small piece of snow, once set in motion.

Start the ball rolling. Set an example of respect for authority, and instill it in your

February 2, 1966

children. Then let your municipal officials know how highly you regard the maintenance of law and order in your community.

Would we do less if anything other than a lack of quality policemen threatened the safety of our homes and communities?

Is There an H-Bomb Under Your Bed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are working on a program under which U.S. military and industrial installations could be blown up by "pocket" nuclear bombs planted by Communist agents in our country.

The Soviet Secret Police, the KGB, are in charge of this guerrilla nuclear bomb operations through an organization named the Partisan Directorate. Their weapons delivery system is called multiple ambulatory nucleonics—MAN for short.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to introduce in the Record an article detailing this threat to our survival by Columnist Ralph de Toledano, of the King Features Syndicate, and distributed under the title "Is There an H-Bomb Under Your Bed?"

The article follows:

IS THERE AN H-BOMB UNDER YOUR BED?

(By Ralph de Toledano)

"Peaceful coexistence" is a term which in the Communist world translates as "subversive warfare." No matter how much and how often the Kremlin protests that it is seeking peaceful competition with the free world, it cannot deny that one of the most important functions of its KGB—successor to the MKVD secret police—is the partisan directorate.

This may sound innocuous enough, but it represents the Soviet Union's major effort against the West. Every guerrilla unit under Communist discipline gets its direction from the partisan directorate. Every Communist Party member may be tapped by this arm of the KGB for subversive work or sabotage. The Kremlin spends untold millions of dollars on the training of effectives for its insurgency program. Schools are run in the Soviet Union to teach the fine points of this kind of underground warfare.

What has this got to do with you and me? We don't expect an American version of the Vietcong or the Castro 26th of July movement to begin operating in the Black Hills or Okefenokee Swamp. And in another era, we could brush aside the possibility of having partisan directorate units at work in the United States.

But something new has been added—nuclear weaponry. And that makes all the difference. Years ago, Medford Evans, recently out of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned that portable components of a nuclear bomb could be smuggled into the United States and assembled here. This would make ICBM bombing of our cities by the Soviet unnecessary. Instead, these bombs could be planted exactly where they would do the most damage and then detonated at the will of the Kremlin.

Mr. Evans received the sneers and contempt of the liberals for his efforts to alert the American Government and people. But

his predictions were not fantastic at all. From a variety of reliable intelligence sources comes the report that portable atomic demolition bombs have been under production in the Soviet Union for some time.

These reports are highly detailed. The Soviets have one atomic demolition bomb that weighs about 75 pounds, is less than 20 inches in length, and packs a wallop equivalent to 100 tons of TNT. A far more powerful bomb, with a yield of five tenths of 1 kiloton (or 500 tons of TNT), is a two-part infernal machine. Each part weighs about 75 pounds and can be put together in less than half an hour.

According to one intelligence source, these partisan directorate atomic weapons have been stored in Cuba, for easy entry into the United States. Soviet embassies in several Latin American countries—including Mexico—have also become arsenals of these hand-carried nuclear weapons. They are equipped with timing devices to protect those who plant them.

The potential of this partisan directorate activity can best be assessed if one recalls an FBI estimate of several years ago. According to this estimate, there are some 5,000 trained agents of the Kremlin in the United States with ready access to our critical industrial and military installations.

Bringing these nuclear demolition devices into the country offers few problems to the Kremlin. All shipments to the Soviet Embassy in Washington are protected by diplomatic immunity. If the State Department succeeds in getting Congress to approve a new consular treaty with the Soviet Union, then there will be hiding places for these bombs in the Nation's key cities. Several of these bombs could devastate New York Harbor and the Golden Gate of San Francisco.

Even without the convenience of consular offices, portable nuclear bombs can be stashed away at secret locations purchased by front men for the Communist apparatus in the United States and manned by partisan directorate personnel. Intelligence experts are reasonably sure that these bombs have not yet been brought into the country—but the operative phrase here is "not yet." Obviously, the Kremlin will not begin to move its nuclear demolition forces at a time when it is trying to lure the American Government into acceptance of its peaceful intentions. But it would be only a matter of days between a decision to move them in and the accomplished fact.

The Communists don't waste their manpower in so futile an exercise. What we may have at any moment is an H-bomb ready to blast where we lay our military and industrial heads to sleep.

Let's Act Quickly on Vets Benefits Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent adjournment of Congress, it was my great privilege to visit with members of our Armed Forces on the battlefield in Vietnam.

The most common question asked of me by these valiant young men was whether, in my opinion, this Congress would enact a Veteran's benefit bill to enable them to pursue their education, and ease the burden of readjustment to

civilian life. I assured them that from my personal conversations with many of my colleagues, in my judgment, this Congress would not ignore the great need to help the veterans who have sacrificed so much in the cause of freedom. And I gave them my promise that I certainly would do all I could to help in getting such legislation passed.

Today, I keep my promise to these valiant men who serve our Nation in our Armed Forces.

Today, I have introduced a bill to provide educational assistance for all veterans who served after January 31, 1955, and to provide for loan guarantee provisions for housing. This bill also makes a number of miscellaneous provisions, in my judgment, long needed to assist the veterans regardless of whether their service was classed as peacetime or wartime. My bill is identical to that introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

This bill provides a permanent program of education assistance for individuals serving after January 31, 1955, on the basis of a month of training for each month, or fraction thereof, of service, not to exceed 36 calendar months. The rates for full-time training set at \$100 per month for a single veteran, \$125 for a veteran with one dependent, and \$150 for a veteran with more than one dependent, and proportionate rates for less than full time.

The education provisions are effective June 1, 1966, and education must be completed within 8 years of the date of discharge.

This bill provides for guaranteed and direct loans, with the VA guaranteeing as much as a maximum of \$7,500 of any loan by private lenders, and authorizes direct loans where private financing is not available to a maximum of \$17,500.

Among the miscellaneous provisions of the bill:

Extends presumptions on chronic and tropical diseases.

Grants medical care for non-service-connected veterans.

Provides job counseling and job placement assistance.

Authorizes a flag to drape the casket of veterans of this service.

Grants preference in Federal employment.

Amends the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act to increase the protection of individuals who are renting homes when they are called into service from the \$80 monthly rental to \$150.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I do not serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I certainly do not class myself as an expert on veterans legislation. I introduce this bill today because I have a deep concern for the sacrifice we are asking of our young men at a most critical time in their lives.

We have, as my colleagues well know, enacted broad programs for those veterans who served in wartime. But I say to you that the wounds are just as deep, the blood just as red, and the grave just as final a resting place in the Dominican

Republic, or in Vietnam, as it was on the battlefields of a formally declared World War II.

All of us here know there will be some opposition to enactment of this program. There are those, both in and out of the administration, who will oppose it primarily because of the cost.

But I say to you—if this Congress and the American taxpayers can be asked to underwrite the massive cost of educating the ignorant of the world—then we have the duty to see to it first that those veterans who gave so much to protect the world receive first consideration.

Mr. Speaker, no man in Congress is more aware of the needs of our veterans than our distinguished friend, "TIGER" TEAGUE. He has earned the respect and admiration of all Americans for his able and dedicated leadership, and under his guidance, our program of veterans' benefits has become a model for the civilized world to follow. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill he has introduced, and which I am proud to co-author. It is my earnest hope that Chairman TEAGUE's committee and this House will take swift action in passing this legislation.

Wealth Can't Replace Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Palos Regional, an independent publication serving southwest suburban Cook County, Ill., has become known throughout the Chicago area for its pertinent, thoughtful, and progressive editorial commentary. In the issue of January 27, it carried a most timely, philosophical commentary on the proper evaluation of freedom. It properly places freedom as the most valuable heritage of our land:

WEALTH CAN'T REPLACE FREEDOM

We live, as every follower of the news media has been told on innumerable occasions, in an affluent society—perhaps the most materially affluent in history. Just about everything has been going up and up, seemingly without pause or end—family income, investment and savings, the gross national product, the enormous sums devoted to industry expansion and betterment of facilities, consumer spending and so on. This, the economists in form us, has been a prosperity unparalleled both in its extent and in the length of time it has continued without a recession.

The Nation has cause to take pride in all this. But it would be morally and practically wrong to look only at the myriad dollar signs and thoughtlessly conclude that all is right, and there is little for the majority of Americans to worry about.

In a far away nation that comparatively few of us could spot accurately on map, we are engaged in one of the cruelest wars in our experience. It is a war which has grown beyond all expectations and, unless every sign is wrong, is destined to grow to a much greater extent still. Soldiers of the United States are dying in tragically increasing numbers in that war. It is making heavy de-

mands on our wealth and our materials, and far larger demands are yet to come. How many of us here at home, during the past holiday season in which every sales record apparently was broken, gave more than passing thought to that war and the vast sacrifices it is demanding of the few? How many of us feel, and share as best we can, the responsibilities that those few are discharging for us all? How many of us realize that there is small affluence—save an affluence of weapons—in Vietnam?

And how many of us realize that, here at home, the odds are heavy that we shall have to abandon many an ambitious government program if we are to maintain this Nation as a bastion and arsenal of freedom in a world where tyrannies are on the march.

The warning signs are up. The prospect of more tax reduction, held out a short time ago, has all but vanished. Informed talk now is of possible tax increases. The welfare state plans, whatever one may think of their desirability, will, it seems certain, be cut back. At the highest levels of government, new and urgent fears of more inflation have recently found a place—and there is more and more realization of the fact that protection of the dollar is absolutely essential to this Nation's strength and even survival.

It is easy, in a time of general prosperity, for a people to avoid problems—to look away from clouds on the horizon. It is also fatal, as history has proven over and over again. The strength of the United States cannot be measured merely in material gains. These, in the long run, are the least of the story. That strength must be measured in moral and spiritual values that place freedom above all things, and a determination to protect our freedom whatever the costs. The mass man is destined for a well-deserved obscurity. Respect for the individual, a knowledge that no two of us are precisely alike, a profound belief in the worth and dignity of each of us—these were the principles on which this Nation was built. They must be sustained if this Nation is to endure.

Let us enjoy our material advantages. But, above all, let us put them in perspective—and never forget that a life of freedom means infinitely more.

Howard Davis (Jack) Todd: Distinguished Merchant, Civic Leader Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, an extremely capable and distinguished business executive turned the tables on his employees when he retired recently at Charleston, S.C.

Instead of permitting his devoted employees to give him the traditional "surprise party," Howard Davis (Jack) Todd, manager of Sears, Roebuck, honored a number of his longtime workers at a dinner. Perhaps this is an unusual twist in retirement ceremonies, but certainly it is typical of the devotion this esteemed merchant holds for his fellow man. Well known for his tireless efforts in behalf of his firm and community, Mr. Todd is an outstanding example of the kind of man our free enterprise system breeds. His interests and activities are extensive—ranging from commercial to charitable and cultural projects. His career

is an example after which our American youth could well pattern their lives. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I hereby insert an editorial and news story from the News and Courier in tribute to a great American:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier]

FRIEND TO CHARLESTON

An able and tireless merchant, Howard Davis Todd, during more than three decades of residence in Charleston, has found time and energy also for countless civic duties. He has shown interest in zoning, commercial, cultural, and charitable enterprises. His good humor has made him a popular as well as a respected citizen. In retiring January 31 after 32 years as manager of the Sears, Roebuck store here, Mr. Todd intends to keep his Charleston residence, though he will spend much of his time traveling, or enjoying outdoor life at his country place on Edisto Island.

The Sears business has grown tremendously at Charleston under Mr. Todd's management. When the company decided to build a large new store, Mr. Todd insisted on locating it in the heart of town rather than moving, as the company frequently has done elsewhere, to the outskirts. Thus he individually has been a notable contributor to the preservation of the business vitality of downtown Charleston.

We have many reasons to like and admire Jack Todd, but this alone is a monument worthy of memory. The best part of it is that the decision was also profitable for his company.

For Mr. and Mrs. Todd we wish many years of health and happiness, wherever they may go—so long as they keep coming back home to Charleston.

TABLES ARE TURNED—RETIRING STORE MANAGER GIVES EMPLOYEES A DINNER

Retiring manager of Charleston Sears, Roebuck store, H. D. Todd turned the tables on his employees last night by honoring them with an appreciation dinner.

Store supervisors who have been associated with the store for a total of 854 years were guests of Todd and his wife last night at the Francis Marion Hotel.

Employees at the dinner included persons who had served 30-, 25-, 20-, 15-, and 10-year tenures.

Mrs. Mary Todd Poore, Todd's daughter, and J. E. Williams of Greensboro, retail zone manager for 29 stores, were special guests.

Todd will have served Sears, Roebuck for 32 years when he retires January 31.

In civic affairs; he is a member of the city's planning and zoning commission and the board of adjustment. He is a member and former vestryman of St. Phillip's Protestant Episcopal Church. He joined Sears in Chicago in 1929 and managed stores in Indianapolis, Montgomery, Tampa, and Savannah.


Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to President Johnson on his decision to refer the problem of Vietnam to the United Nations as a further

step in his effort to explore and exhaust every possibility of bringing peace to that war-torn area of the world.

We Californians, in particular, support the President in this new peace initiative, because for both historic and geographic reasons we fully appreciate the President's desire that America play an important leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom and in building the foundations for peace among the nations of the world.

Located as we are on the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean, and with many of our citizens having close family, ethnic, language and cultural ties with the people of other Pacific nations, we have always been an outward-looking society—a true melting pot of the strength and diversity of backgrounds that have made America great—with an immediate and personal interest in establishing good constructive relations with our neighbors in the Pacific community.

For these reasons, we can only applaud the President's action in seeking the assistance of the world organization in attempting to find the way to a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

Certainly every American endorses our Government's proposed resolution submitted to the United Nations Security Council calling for "immediate discussions without preconditions * * * to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia."

In addition, we can all support the U.S. resolution's recommendation that "the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision."

Finally, we welcome the broad language included in our resolution suggesting that the U.N. offer "to assist in achieving the purpose of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators."

Mr. Speaker, I am personally very proud and happy that President Johnson has taken these affirmative steps to engage the best efforts of the international community of nations in our continued search for meaningful negotiations and a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

I have this deep personal interest and pride because I was one of several Members of Congress who made similar suggestions to the President some time ago—and if my efforts in this matter have had even a small part in influencing or reinforcing the President's determination to enlist the help of the United Nations in calling a peace conference, in proposing unconditional discussions, in advocating an effective cease-fire, or in suggesting use of the techniques of arbitration and mediation—then, Mr. Speaker, my efforts have been amply rewarded and I am extremely happy to have played a constructive role in trying to move the tragic fighting in southeast Asia from the battlefield to the conference table.

I am confident that I share the hope of the overwhelming majority of Americans that the United Nations act

promptly to take advantage of this opportunity to advance the cause of world peace and put an end to the war in Vietnam.

If the U.N. should fail to assume its responsibility in this vital matter, we will all be the losers. Then, the chances of a peaceful settlement of the present situation will have been reduced, and the future usefulness of the world body in settling international disputes will have been diminished.

Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who live secure in a Nation where the Government is of our own creation, governed by institutions which are bound by the motto: "Of the people, by the people and for the people," it is difficult to understand the national frustration of peoples obliged to live under the rule of a foreign power.

Since the rule of Catherine the second in the 18th century, the Ukrainian people have lived under foreign rule. Occasionally their hopes have been rekindled by a relaxation of the grip or a military defeat suffered by their rulers, but in every instance, the Ukrainians have been cast back under foreign control.

The great hope of the Ukrainians came in 1917, when after two sudden revolutions, a new Russian Government assumed the reins of power and proclaimed the rights of all the nationalities of Russia to self-determination. The Ukrainians were one of the first to take advantage of the new policy and joyously proclaimed their independence. They were able to enjoy it just long enough to sign a separate peace treaty with Germany as Russia left World War I.

Unfortunately, the Bolsheviks had not been serious about the autonomy of the nationalities. They saw it as a means of weakening the unity of the imperial regime. Once safely in control, the Communist government of Russia clamped down on the nationalities, including the Ukraine.

To this day the Communist control over the Ukraine continues. This rule is imposed by the same group of men who claim themselves the champions of national independence movements. It is a tragic irony indeed. Yet, in all of this, one light of hope continues to glow; it is the unswerving national identity and dignity of the Ukrainian people. Despite the harsh attempts at Communist assimilation, the national character of the Ukrainian people stands triumphant.

Let us pause, Mr. Speaker, to take this moment to salute the proud people of the Ukraine.

Washington Airport No Place for Jets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the recent decision of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit jets to operate from Washington National Airport, particularly in view of the proposal to spend \$150 million of the taxpayers' money to enable that airport to handle such planes.

Many years ago when we were considering legislation to authorize the construction of Dulles International Airport, I took the floor to warn my colleagues that the proposed airport could not be built for the \$34 million the administration was requesting. History proved that I was right because we have already spent more than \$110 million on Dulles. But we were told then that this new airport was to handle jet traffic and that Washington National Airport could never handle jets because it is already overcrowded and because of the noise factor. Now, the FAA has reversed its previous decision and has stated that with \$150 million Washington National can be made to handle jets.

I am opposed to the use of Washington National by jets because I think it is unsafe and because of the noise and because I think it is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money to spend another \$150 million on airport facilities when we already have Dulles and Friendship International Airports to handle jet traffic. Neither of these facilities is operating at anything near capacity and these two airports can handle all the jet traffic for the Washington area for many, many years to come because they both have plenty of room for expansion.

One of our great Baltimore newspapers, the News American, recently ran a series of articles by Mr. Ray Abrams, Jr., calling attention to the recent growth of airports in the Washington area and I recommend that all of my colleagues give serious consideration to the problems outlined therein. The articles are as follows:

[From the Baltimore News American, Jan. 23, 1966]

AIRPORT NIGHTMARE—JETS JOIN IN JAM AT D.C. NATIONAL

(By Ray Abrams, Jr.)

(Because of the obviously short memories of Federal aviation authority officials, Baltimore's Friendship Airport, once more faces an uncertain future. Following the FAA's decision to permit small jets to use federally owned Washington National Airport, News American Staffer Ray Abrams, Jr., conducted a study of the three airports servicing the Baltimore-Washington area, Friendship, National, and Dulles at Chantilly, Va. Abrams' first of a three-part series, "The Airport Nightmare," begins today.)

On a June morning in 1938, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt awoke shuddering from a nightmare.

Today Laney and other Quincy Shipyard officials point with pride to the negotiated contract that followed the work slowdown. The Nation's first 4-year labor contract in the shipbuilding industry, it gave a 32-cent-an-hour pay raise over that period, nine annual paid holidays, 2-week vacation after 1 year, and other benefits.

"We probably did do some injustice to workers in the beginning, without a contract," admits one General Dynamics official (not Laney) today. "But based on our own evaluation, it appeared a lot of the workers were overrated. If wage rates were too high at the start, we wouldn't have had a chance of being competitive or making the thing go."

Quincy had hired many men back in lower classes and refused to take over all retirement programs for long-term Bethlehem employees. But under the new contract, the yard agreed to give seniority after 4 years shipbuilding experience and also agreed to review ratings on men with much more experience.

Generally labor is pleased with the 9-month-old contract.

"We're satisfied with the outlook for the future, though we're not satisfied with everything," says George McPherson, executive secretary of Local 5, Shipbuilders Union, which represents most of the workers in the yard. "Any grievances we have, we think can be bargained out." He explains labor is bargaining with management on about 300 grievances.

"We think this will turn out to be a top yard. Things looked pretty grim after Bethlehem closed," he muses.

The yard is busy, the company is still hiring, and work has not yet begun on \$141 million worth of contracts the shipyard won in 1965.

The contracts are for two ammunition ships, one submarine tender, and two fleet replenishment oilers. Ironically the ammunition ships' contract was won over Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point, Md., yard, although a couple of weeks ago Quincy lost out to the same yard for two more of the ships.

Last year Quincy workers also produced a harbor hurricane gate for Stamford, Conn., a missile launching trainer for the Navy's Polaris submarine crewmen, two new floating heavyweight shock platforms and also transferred midbodies from the T-2 tankers under conversion to two commercial tankers.

With 1966 just a few weeks old, Quincy plans five key layings, two launchings and possibly two deliveries in the next 12 months. The plant also is going shopping for a share of the Navy's \$1.9 billion shipbuilding program for the remainder of the current fiscal year and will keep its eyes open for the fiscal 1967 list due to be announced at the end of this month.

"We'll go after the big ones," says Laney.

The Quincy yard also is setting its sights on an estimated \$1.5 billion "total package" contract for a fleet of new, fast Navy cargo ships and already is developing proposals for the job.

Whoever wins the contract likely could hold the reins on future building of surface ships. The new concept gives one shipbuilder a single contract to design, construct and develop the new ships.

"We're determined to get the contract, despite keen competition," emphasizes the tall, slim yard manager. "It would make a big difference in the yard, give us a chance to plan ahead for several years. It would stabilize the workload."

Laney, a man accustomed to measuring success on a day-by-day basis, by no means thinks the Quincy yard has turned the corner toward success.

General Dynamics has put \$1 million into the operation; not a substantial sum in terms of multimillion-dollar industrial investments, but substantial enough to show the

parent company's interest in its young branch.

The single most important factor in Quincy's upward swing thus far, believes Laney, is the transfer from Groton of a bright, young, aggressive and fresh approach.

"There is a belief in the future of the yard. Many employees are working in the same spot they were 2 years ago, but they are producing more."

Yet, he cautions: "Our 6,700 employees is better than 2 years ago when there weren't any, but that doesn't spell success. Remember, we haven't completed our first ship yet."

Quincy, however, has quite a few good things going for it.

One of these, in Laney's view, is the 4-year labor contract which gives the company a firm springboard in seeking major contracts. Serious labor problems and large labor demands were reasons, and maybe the primary ones, for the downfall of the Bethlehem yard.

Another reason for the upswing might be found in the two words "Cost Reduction." Continually General Dynamics surveys the yard, checking out and eliminating waste in electricity, telephones, steam heat, and other areas. Last year 116 million gallons of water (enough for 900 families) was conserved as a result of such a survey.

Laney himself daily walks through a portion of the yard to see the operation firsthand. Another top executive inspects the entire yard from 5 to 7 a.m. each day.

"If we're going to be successful in competitive bidding, we've got to cut all the fat out of the operation," says Laney, a former Navy captain, who has spent most of his life in shipbuilding.

Still another reason for the positive outlook at Quincy is its interdependent relationship with its sister shipyard in Groton.

Quincy got its first boost in talent and equipment from that yard and may draw on that yard whenever needed. "Each yard has a dominant interest, but each is capable of working in the other field," says Laney.

"One of the most interesting things in the development of the Quincy operation has been the mixture of the shipbuilding and submarinebuilding people. The difference in building each is like the difference between building an airplane and a submarine."

Half of the current workload at Quincy is in submarine construction. The *Whale* and the *Sunfish* are expected to be launched this year, and the *Greenling* and the *Gato* are being outfitted with equipment.

Little if any additional submarine construction is planned at Quincy, though there may be additional submarine repair work.

Quincy will concentrate as originally intended, on surface ships.

Already the *Vanguard*, the first of the three Apollo instrumentation ships, is scheduled for sea trials later this month. The *Redstone* is being outfitted with electronic and marine equipment and preliminary hull work is underway on the *Mercury*.

And there are the contracts for those five other surface ships.

Yet the Quincy shipyard is operating at only one-third capacity, and that's the way the company wants it.

Laney expects the current work force of 6,700 to remain steady for the next year at least. He conservatively predicts a high of 8,000 employees for the yard. But, he hastily adds, "It all depends on contracts."

"We won't be able to tell which way the yard is going for at least another 2 or 3 years. While contract price remains frozen and fixed, other things can change during the contract life. Dangers are escalation of costs, bad weather and loss of employees."

The manpower situation, in fact, constantly plagues the yard. It faces a critical shortage of experienced shipfitters, electricians and outside machinists and is con-

stantly advertising these positions. To curb the crisis somewhat, it is training 105 young men in 10 different trades in its own apprentice program and retraining another 50 under the U.S. Manpower Development and Training Act.

"Only the best shipbuilders can be successful," say Laney. "Profits are sparse. We're caught in an economic squeeze. Since World War II, 20 private shipyards have folded and most today are operating at half capacity."

"Quincy will have to get a number of major new contracts if it's going to turn that corner toward success. But we're determined to get those contracts."

Management, labor and certainly the South Shore and even Greater Boston communities are in agreement on that philosophy.

The rebirth of the shipyard has shown up dramatically on the South Shore area where 75 percent of its \$40 million payroll is distributed.

The Quincy Chamber of Commerce reports an increase in apartment house construction, hotel and motel business and retail business. The Quincy Shipyard shares in that impact with other growing industries in the area.

Not bad for a 2-year-old toddler.

A Marine's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from Cpl. Lawrence Torrez, of California, now stationed in Vietnam.

Corporal Torrez is the brother of Mrs. Ray Inda. Mr. Ray Inda is the president of the C.I. Forum, which is a great public service organization.

Two months ago, I traveled to Vietnam and met with over 400 U.S. servicemen there. The morale of our troops in Vietnam was excellent. I was never prouder to be an American than to hear the troops with whom I spoke declare to a man that we must not leave the people of South Vietnam to Communist domination.

I believe that the letter from Corporal Torrez sums up very well the feelings expressed to me by most of the soldiers I spoke with. They were all very concerned about demonstrations here in the United States and many asked if there was not something which could be done about them. I believe Corporal Torrez expresses in his letter that a majority of the people of the United States support our efforts to allow the people of South Vietnam to determine their own destiny.

Corporal Torrez is obviously a young man of intelligence and dedication who represents the best in the idealism of American youth.

A MARINE'S VIEWS

(By Cpl. Lawrence Torrez)

EDITOR OF THE SUN-TELEGRAM:

My name is Cpl. Lawrence Torrez, and I am a U.S. marine stationed in Chu Lai, Vietnam. Along with me, there are 12 other marines

Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
You served your country with honor and
might,
You piloted the ship through chaos and
strife,
Safe in port you brought her through the
darkness of night.

With the election of '32 a brighter dawn was
breaking,
Giving new hopes to people who were for-
gotten before.

A new ray of life began pouring forward,
You master conqueror of darkness forever
and ever more.

Now you lie in state and the Nation mourns
for their friend, protector and guider of
democracy—cost what it may.

With pride we call your name,
Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was Presi-
dent of the U.S.A.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Observer,
Nov. 18, 1964]

A SYMBOL OF VISION
(By Leo Lipp)

(In honor of the anniversary of the death
of a martyr, President John F. Kennedy.)

Electrifying were the words that pierced
the hearts of men

Exclaimed by his wife, Jacqueline, "Ob, no."
Throughout the world their sound re-
echoed,

People turned to each other, crying, "It can-
not be. It is not so."

Yet it was true: The President of the United
States was killed.

He fell a martyr at the hand of an assassin.
Why?

The bullet which took his life left many
desolate—

Millions believe as he did—this none can
deny.

He was taken away from us in the prime of
life

When he had so much to live for, and so
much to give

To the people of the world as well as of our
Nation.

Is this the reward for a humanitarian to
receive?

We heard the solemn sound of feet marching
to the beat of Army drums

On the avenue where he had walked not very
long ago:

We saw the casket where his body rested,
and the sad cortege.

America wept; and made a silent pledge
to remember him in deeds

A happier world might know.

In Arlington an eternal light is burning,
A symbol that the road to freedom must
never be dark.

Spiritual light is the guide to human happi-
ness;

Its torch must burn with a penetrating
spark.

Which will ignite the will in the minds of
men

To turn toward that light for inspiration.

John F. Kennedy lived and died for more
than integration—

His goal for all was true emancipation.

The Amazing Rebirth of Quincy Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the United
States presently stands in 12th place

among the shipbuilding nations of the
world. The Soviet Union is building new
merchant ships at a rate 14 times greater
than ours and both Japan and Germany
are far ahead of the United States in
ship construction and registry.

As a result of long years of neglect,
our merchant marine carries only 9 per-
cent of our foreign trade. We do have
a mothball fleet, and in the past 5
years have had to refit, at heavy cost,
more than 50 ships. These refitted ves-
sels are not the modern ships that we
should have. More ships from this
mothball fleet are being refitted, and
still there has been no positive decision
on a well-planned shipbuilding program
in American shipyards. In lieu of this,
our Departments of Defense and Inter-
rior have sounded out the possibilities of
building ships in Britain and even in
Poland. A decision of this nature could
ruin an industry vital to national de-
fense and economic prosperity.

In my 11th Congressional District in
Massachusetts, there is the Quincy Ship-
yard, 83 years in existence and bought
by the General Dynamics Corp. from the
Bethlehem Steel Co. in 1963. Here is
one company in the United States that
had foresight in the needs of American
shipbuilding and was willing to gamble
in this purchase, that the United States
would see fit to expand the American
merchant marine in all categories and
in 2 years has put itself in a position to
assist in this needed expansion. I take
this opportunity to include an article on
the rebirth of the Quincy Shipyard from
the January 14, 1966, edition of the Bos-
ton Sunday Herald:

THE AMAZING REBIRTH OF QUINCY SHIPYARD
(By Loretta Leone)

(NOTE.—Shut down only 2 years ago, the
plant has bounced back under new manage-
ment with \$275 million in contracts and a
\$40 million payroll. What's behind the
comeback?)

At the Quincy Shipyard on Fore River these
days smokestacks send black jets into the
sky. Steel-helmeted men climb ladders and
platforms, working on nuclear submarines
and ships. Giant magnets move back and
forth carrying steel plates into welding shops
for molding into ship hulls.

The flurry of activity is quite a contrast to
the scene 2 years ago when on a cold, snowy
and miserable day several hundred men
closed down machinery at the former Bethle-
hem Steel Shipyard and, desparingly, went
home—unemployed.

As the new General Dynamics Quincy
Shipyard enters its third year of production,
6,700 workers pass through its gates each
day and the help wanted sign is still out.

The yard holds about \$275 million in con-
tracts for submarines and surface ships, has
a \$40 million payroll and employs one-third
of industrial workers in the Quincy area and
one-fifth of those on the entire South Shore.

General Dynamics bought the then 80-
year-old shipbuilding facility from Bethle-
hem Steel December 31, 1963, for an esti-
mated \$5 million after several months of
negotiating.

Under Bethlehem, owners for 53 years, the
former Fore River Shipyard boomed during
World War II, peaking at 24,000 employees;
had a peacetime high of 13,000 only 5 years
ago, and then quickly dwindled in its last
days to about 800 men.

Even in its waning years the plant had
produced the Nation's first nuclear surface
ships—the guided missile destroyer *Bain-
bridge* and the guided missile cruiser *Long
Beach*. Yet it could not keep moving

How could General Dynamics expect to
establish a new operation at the same old
stand and make it work?

With a will to win, answered Quincy Ship-
yard Manager Robert V. Laney, the other
day. "It was the beginning of a new yard
with different purposes and motives and a
different spirit."

Laney managed the Bethlehem yard in its
final years, heading projects which produced
the *Bainbridge* and the *Long Beach*. He well
remembers the despair and discouragement
which settled on the men as production
petered out.

General Dynamics already was successfully
building the bulk of the Nation's Polaris
submarine fleet in its Electric Boat Division
in Groton, Conn. It foresaw a promising and
profitable future in the surface ship field,
and decided to distribute its eggs into two
baskets in a dual operation.

It set out immediately on its new task,
starting from scratch. It had bought only
the physical plant: 175 acres and 89 build-
ings, 4 outfitting piers, a 10,000-ton float-
ing drydock and 3 building basins.

First, General Dynamics closed the ship-
yard, severing all ties with the former parent.
Then it gave it a new name—the Quincy
Shipyard.

Forty keymen were brought up from Gro-
ton to assess the yard and start it moving
again.

Laney still vividly recalls the hollow beat
of the footsteps of these men and some 50
maintenance and security men on macadam
and concrete as they walked through the
deserted yard during its 6-week shutdown
and reorganizational period.

Hiring for the new shipyard began in late
January 1964. Some 4,000 persons showed
up at the State employment office in Quincy
that first day, the long line stretching down
Parkway.

By mid-February, the first 200 new em-
ployees walked through the gate on East
Howard Street and the yard began to come
alive again.

First order of business was cleaning and
rehabilitating machinery and tools which
had been idle for weeks and even years, and
redecorating the premises.

Some small production work was done on
odd jobs around the yard, but it wasn't un-
til April when some 500 employees were on
the payroll that production really got un-
derway.

Quincy Shipyard had inherited from Beth-
lehem a \$61.9 million contract to build two
nuclear attack submarines, the *Whale* and
the *Sunfish*. The keel for the *Whale* was
laid May 27, 1964. In addition, two nuclear
attack subs, the *Greenling* and the *Gato*,
were towed up from the Groton facility into
the Quincy building basins for lengthening.

The men in the yard began to feel the
shipyard stir.

Four months later, in September, General
Dynamics won a \$65 million NASA contract
to convert three World War II Navy T-2
tankers into floating electronic islands for
tracking the Nation's astronauts on their
trip to the moon. The bulk of the award
for the *Vanguard*, the *Redstone*, and the *Mer-
cury* went to the Quincy yard for hull struc-
tural work. Electronics and instrumentation
are being handled by two other G.D. divi-
sions.

The future began to look brighter for
Quincy, but there were problems, too.

At its first birthday, in January 1965,
5,300 persons were on the yard's payroll. Half
of the men in the yard were former Bethle-
hem employees.

Since General Dynamics bought only the
physical plant, the men began work without
benefit of a labor contract. From the start
they were disgruntled over pay and senior-
ity.

The discontent erupted during contract
negotiations and 3,000 production and clerical
workers walked off their jobs one day to
protest lack of progress in negotiations.

from other parts of the United States, with Sgt. Thomas W. Conrad from North Hollywood, who is in charge of our small group.

I am a resident of San Bernardino. I attended school in San Bernardino all through the years until I graduated from SBHS.

We read the Stars and Stripes newspaper daily, and we have all discussed with each other our feelings toward all the demonstrations going on all over the United States about the war in Vietnam. I would like to let you know our personal opinions and what we think of it.

It seems that our real enemies are back home—not here in Vietnam. I have read about communism and have seen what it does just by looking at these people here in Vietnam, plus the fact there are people trying desperately to leave Communist worlds like East Germany, Cuba, Red China, and so many more.

Do these college students feel they know more than these people who have actually experienced the ways of communism?

We heard of the welcoming our marines have been receiving as they arrive in the United States from Vietnam. They (welcoming group) called our marines murderers and a lot of other dirty names, not getting any gratitude for what they had been through.

I'd like to see every one of those punks drafted, but I'd hate to see them be in the U.S. Marine Corps. But if they ever did come into this outfit, I guarantee you this, the Marine Corps would square them away—and mighty fast.

I'm glad the real "citizens" of the United States are on our side, and are giving us their support in stopping communism from spreading.

This letter is not intended to criticize all the people of the United States—not by a long shot. Only those few who have the shoes that fit.

Mr. Truman's Gloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent comments made by our former President on the state of the world are sad but true.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a fine editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on January 27:

MR. TRUMAN'S GLOOM

Out in his hometown of Independence, Harry Truman the other day made some very poignant remarks about the state of the world as it has become since his own active efforts ceased.

Surveying things as they are and comparing them with things as they were in his administration, the former President said sadly, "It all seems to have been in vain. Memories are short and appetites for power and glory are insatiable. Old tyrants depart. New ones take their places. Old differences are composed. New differences arise. Old allies become the foe. The recent enemy becomes the friend. It's all very baffling and trying."

It is very baffling and trying. Almost every sentence in Mr. Truman's elegy is an accurate statement of events in the world during and since his administration. Except one: the first. It has not been in vain.

Americans generally fought through World War II with an expectation of permanent

peace to follow victory. It was a great wrench to see Soviet Russia, our ally, arise as a new threat to peace. Mr. Truman boldly and decisively met that threat in Greece, in Persia, and elsewhere. He met it, too, by the economic aid which restored Europe to health and made communism an ideological curiosity in the West rather than a possible alternative.

And then, yet another tyrant and new difference arose in the East. Again, in Korea, Mr. Truman met this new threat with determined resistance. He established a line and the line has held.

The international relations of the United States in the years since World War II have been infinitely complicated and give promise only of further complexity. But peace of a sort has been preserved. The line has been held.

The nature of life itself is to have one new peril swiftly replace an old one contained. Mr. Truman did what had to be done, and deserves freedom from sad second thoughts in his twilight years.

Dr. William B. Edwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Lakewood, Ohio, which I represent, was shocked and saddened Monday by the unexpected, untimely death of Dr. William B. Edwards, nationally known educator and the superintendent of our Lakewood school system since 1955.

Lakewood's young people are the finest memorial Dr. Edwards could have to his intense concern for quality education. His standards were the highest and the city's schools reflect those standards in outstanding curriculum and student scholarship. In all his striving for academic excellence, he never lost the human touch which endeared him to those who knew him.

Dr. Edwards was unsparing of himself in his community interests. He was a member of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, past president of the South Euclid Kiwanis Club, president of the executive council of the Greater Cleveland Chapter of the Boy Scouts and a member of the American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, and the Horace Mann League.

The Cleveland Press and Plain Dealer have paid high editorial tribute to Dr. Edwards' achievements in the decade he served the Greater Cleveland area.

The editorials follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Jan. 31, 1966]

WILLIAM B. EDWARDS

The death this morning of William B. Edwards, Lakewood's superintendent of schools, removes from the scene one of this area's ablest, hardest working, and most distinguished educators.

Edwards, 56, took over the Lakewood job in 1955. At that time Omar Ranney, late press staffer who was on the Lakewood School

Board, said: "We feel we have obtained one of the Nation's top school administrators."

Today Ranney's son Phil, who is himself on the school board, said of Edwards: "What made him such an excellent superintendent was the fact that he didn't get bogged down in details to the extent that he forgot that the main thing he was dealing in was boys and girls."

Edwards came to Lakewood after heading the school systems in South Euclid-Lyndhurst and later in Peoria, Ill. He was known for his leadership in civic affairs on a county-wide basis and vigorously fought for school levies against often-determined opposition.

Edwards was gregarious, articulate, and likeable. His enthusiasm for his work and his keen concern that boys and girls get the best education possible made him a truly outstanding educator.

His concern for education took many forms. He was quick to offer Lakewood's facilities for Ohio branch colleges in 1951. And just recently he instituted a course of Afro-Asian studies in the suburb's schools because he thought youngsters need to know about cultures other than those of the Western World.

There are not many William B. Edwardses. He will be sorely missed.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Feb. 1, 1966]

DR. WILLIAM B. EDWARDS

Dr. William B. Edwards was a creative and deeply devoted superintendent of Lakewood schools for more than 10 years. His sudden death at 56 is a severe blow to Lakewood and to the entire metropolitan community.

All Greater Cleveland is indebted to Dr. Edwards for the enthusiasm and diligence he brought to his work with the Boy Scouts, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Community Chest and such important cultural activities as the Great Lakes Shakespeare Festival, which he served for a time as president.

The Lakewood school system will miss him not only for his fine qualities as a man but for the spirit of useful innovation and the emphasis on excellence that marked his decade in the superintendent's chair.

Dr. Edwards knew that no school system could be better than its teachers. He therefore gave great attention to in-service training. And he devised and won school board approval for a plan that gave career teachers summer pay every fifth year for university study.

Lakewood schools were among the first in the area to offer foreign languages in the fifth grade of elementary school. They were among the first to pursue "modern math."

Lakewood High School was the first in the State to require driver training of all its students and this too was a step inspired by Dr. Edwards.

Dr. Edwards' life was one of immense usefulness in a field he loved. The community will miss him.

The 1964 Income of Male Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include further statistics provided by the Veterans' Administration on the 1964 money income of male cold war veterans:

TABLE 2.—Money income in 1964 of male cold war veteran families, by age of head, in the United States
 (Age of veteran family head in March 1965)

Income in 1964	All family heads				Family heads with wife present											
	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All				Wife with earnings				Wife with no earnings			
					All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over
Number (thousands)	1,279	435	1,791	245	1,232	426	1,773	245	1,115	257	836	218	1,137	169	937	227
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$500	.5	1.7	.2	.5	1.9	.2	.5	1.9	.2	.5	.3	.2	1.1	4.4	.4	.4
\$500 to \$999	.4	.6	.3	.4	.7	.3	.4	.7	.2	.5	.3	.2	.7	1.7	.3	.3
\$1,000 to \$1,499	1.2	2.6	.8	1.2	2.8	.8	1.2	2.8	1.1	1.5	1.0	.2	1.4	4.4	.7	.7
\$1,500 to \$1,999	.4	.5	.5	.4	.4	.5	.4	.4	.2	.2	.2	.2	.6	1.1	.1	.1
\$2,000 to \$2,499	1.3	2.6	1.0	1.4	2.8	1.1	1.4	2.8	1.2	1.8	1.0	.2	1.6	3.9	1.1	1.1
\$2,500 to \$2,999	2.4	4.1	1.9	2.4	4.2	1.9	2.4	4.2	2.2	2.6	1.9	.2	2.6	6.6	2.0	2.0
\$3,000 to \$3,499	3.6	6.6	3.0	3.6	6.5	3.1	3.6	6.5	3.1	2.9	2.0	.2	5.1	12.7	3.9	3.9
\$3,500 to \$3,999	4.7	6.7	4.2	4.7	6.6	4.3	4.7	6.6	3.1	2.6	3.4	.2	6.2	12.7	5.1	5.1
\$4,000 to \$4,499	5.7	8.6	5.0	5.7	8.7	5.0	5.7	8.7	3.7	10.9	5.3	.2	4.7	5.5	4.7	4.7
\$4,500 to \$4,999	5.1	5.8	5.0	5.1	5.9	4.9	5.1	5.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	.2	6.4	9.4	6.0	6.0
\$5,000 to \$5,499	7.9	12.2	7.0	8.0	12.2	7.1	8.0	12.2	8.3	14.9	6.5	.2	7.6	8.3	7.6	7.6
\$5,500 to \$5,999	7.5	8.8	7.3	7.5	8.0	7.2	7.5	8.0	6.9	10.2	6.0	.2	8.1	7.2	8.4	8.4
\$6,000 to \$6,499	8.0	7.9	8.2	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	6.5	9.4	5.7	.2	9.4	6.1	10.2	10.2
\$6,500 to \$6,999	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.5	5.4	5.2	3.6	5.7	.2	5.9	8.3	5.5	5.5
\$7,000 to \$7,999	11.5	11.2	11.6	11.6	11.3	11.7	11.6	11.3	11.7	14.2	11.0	.2	11.5	7.2	12.3	12.3
\$8,000 to \$8,999	10.3	3.6	12.0	10.3	3.7	11.9	10.3	3.7	11.8	6.2	13.6	.2	8.9	10.5	10.5	10.5
\$9,000 to \$9,999	7.4	3.7	8.2	7.3	3.3	8.2	7.3	3.3	9.0	5.4	9.7	.2	5.7	6.8	6.8	6.8
\$10,000 to \$10,999	9.0	4.9	9.8	9.0	5.2	9.8	9.0	5.2	10.4	7.3	11.4	.2	7.6	1.6	8.4	8.4
\$11,000 to \$11,999	4.5	2.2	5.0	4.2	1.2	4.9	4.2	1.2	5.9	1.8	7.1	.2	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9
\$12,000 to \$14,999	2.8	.6	3.1	2.7	.7	3.1	2.7	.7	3.6	1.1	4.3	.2	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.1
\$15,000 to \$24,999	.3	.3	.3	.4	.4	.3	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.5	.4	.4	.4
\$25,000 and over																
Median ²	\$6,620	\$5,450	\$7,000		\$6,600	\$5,400	\$7,000		\$7,220	\$5,950	\$7,660		\$6,220	\$4,310	\$6,460	

¹ Includes cold war veterans under 20 years of age.
² Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

³ Computed from rounded data, and rounded to the nearest \$10.
 NOTE.—Rounds to zero.

TABLE 3.—Money income in 1964 of male cold war veteran unrelated individuals and of cold war veterans living in a relative's family, by age, in the United States

(Age in March 1965)

Income in 1964	Relatives of family head				Unrelated individuals			
	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over	All ages	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 and over
Number (thousands)	1,840	465	338	26	1,208	277	127	22
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$500	12.9	14.5	8.5	1.0	3.4	1.3	1.3	1.3
\$500 to \$999	9.9	11.7	6.4	3.4	1.9	3.1	3.1	3.1
\$1,000 to \$1,499	9.9	13.3	4.7	6.7	4.3	3.8	3.8	3.8
\$1,500 to \$1,999	8.7	8.9	8.5	4.3	3.2	1.9	1.9	1.9
\$2,000 to \$2,499	10.4	14.9	4.5	5.3	8.2	5.7	5.7	5.7
\$2,500 to \$2,999	7.1	9.9	4.3	8.2	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
\$3,000 to \$3,499	4.3	4.0	4.7	7.2	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7
\$3,500 to \$3,999	5.8	3.8	9.2	9.6	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.4
\$4,000 to \$4,499	6.2	7.8	4.3	8.6	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2
\$4,500 to \$4,999	5.5	3.2	8.8	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6
\$5,000 to \$5,499	4.5	3.8	5.7	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
\$5,500 to \$5,999	3.1	1.0	5.9	3.6	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.6
\$6,000 to \$6,499	4.6	1.6	9.2	4.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
\$6,500 to \$6,999	1.5	.6	2.8	4.8	16.3	16.3	16.3	16.3
\$7,000 to \$7,999	3.0	1.0	5.9	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
\$8,000 to \$8,999	1.7		4.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
\$9,000 to \$9,999	.2		.7	2.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
\$10,000 to \$11,999	.5		1.2	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
\$12,000 to \$14,999			.7	1.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2							
\$25,000 and over								
Median ²	\$2,420	\$2,060	\$3,960		\$4,640		\$5,790	

¹ Includes cold war veterans under 20 years of age.
² Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

³ Computed from rounded data, and rounded to the nearest \$10.
 NOTE.—Rounds to zero.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data: Information about the 1964 income of male civilian noninstitutional cold war veterans in the United States was derived from the Bureau of the Census matched February-March 1965 Current Population Survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The family relationship data were obtained for families headed by male cold war veterans, for cold war veterans living alone or with nonrelatives, and for cold war veterans living in the family of a relative. The work experience data were collected for year-round, full-time workers, part-year and/or part-time workers, and for nonworkers. The income-family relation-

ship and the income-work experience distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional cold war veteran population in the United States to develop the data presented in this report. Although income and work experience data are for the year 1964, the age and family relationship refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see Consumer Income, Current Population Reports Series P-60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

Money income was the sum of money wages and salaries, net money income from self-employment, and money income other

than earnings such as social security, veterans' payments, interest and dividends, annuities, etc. The income of families (table 2) was the amount received by all members of the family. The income by work experience (table 1), and the income of cold war veteran relatives of the head and cold war veteran unrelated individuals (table 3) was that received by the veteran alone. All families includes family groups in which the cold war veteran was married (wife present or absent), or he was widowed, divorced, or never married, but still the head of a family. Husband-wife families are only those in which the cold war veteran was married and his wife was present.

ican citizens, I oppose the violence and extremism that has been characteristic of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan just as I resist the conspiratorial efforts of the far left. The issue before us in the recomittal motion presented by my Republican colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable Silvio CONTE, represents an effort to improve and make more fair the contempt proceedings of the House of Representatives as these procedures will apply to all parties falling within the jurisdiction of this House.

Pure and Simple Juggling in Budget Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert the following article from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News of January 25, 1966:

PURE AND SIMPLE JUGGLING IS THE PRIMARY TALENT IN BUDGET PREPARATION

(By Jack W. Gore)

In attempting to analyze President Johnson's new budget, there are several points which must be kept well in mind before any firm conclusions can be drawn.

To begin with, it must be recognized that Federal budgetmaking can hardly be termed an exact science. At best, even the most conscientious budgetmakers can only come up with educated guesses in regard to Government income and expenditures, as they can no more foretell the course of future events than anybody else.

It should also be remembered that the budget presented to Congress by the President yesterday covers a fiscal year that doesn't start until next July 1 and doesn't end until June 30 of 1967. Thus, any number of things can happen over the next 18 months to alter just about everything in this massive estimate of Government revenue and Government spending.

Another point to remember is that figures can be juggled around to prove most anything any President or his advisers want to prove. Revenues can be overestimated and expenses underestimated in such a fashion as to make it appear the Government is only going to operate on a minor deficit level when just the opposite situation is almost certain to prove true.

To emphasize this fact it is only necessary to note that President Johnson asked the Congress just a few days ago for some \$12 billion more than had originally been requested in his current budget to meet the soaring costs of the war in Vietnam. Much of this extra money will not be used during the current budget year, but by requesting the funds now Mr. Johnson has been able to reduce next year's military budget sufficiently to brag about the small deficit his new budget predicts.

This is bookkeeping juggling pure and simple, yet by resorting to this sort of thing Mr. Johnson hopes to persuade the Congress that this Nation can well afford not only to fight a very costly war but also to greatly increase the amount of money he wishes to pour into the expansion of his Great Society program.

The President is also hoping to achieve another objective through his figure juggling techniques. The prospect of just a small budget deficit in the upcoming fiscal year is nowhere near as frightening from an inflationary standpoint as a great big deficit would be.

And since the President has declared war on inflation, he hardly wants to put himself in a position of advocating such a tremendous budget deficit next year as to give powerful impetus to the inflationary cycle that has already started.

In this respect it must be noted that Mr. Johnson has carefully prepared an escape hatch for himself should his present estimates of spending an revenue prove to be highly unrealistic. He has stated that should higher expenditures become necessary to carry on the war in Vietnam, or should a strong inflationary trend develop, he will not hesitate to ask Congress for additional money or to seek higher taxes.

Thus, the President hasn't put himself so far out on a limb with his new budget he can't crawl back to safety should it start to snap. If the figure juggling he has done backfires on him later in the year, he can then ask for more money and higher taxes and still say it is in line with what he said he would do when he presented the budget to Congress.

In the meantime he can claim credit for coming up with an almost balanced budget without sacrificing either guns or butter. The fact that this accomplishment was made possible through such sleight-of-hand practices as speeding up tax payments to provide the Government with an additional \$4.5 billion in revenue without actually raising taxes will largely be overlooked for the present as most people tend to look at results instead of how such results are to be accomplished.

President Johnson has never been one to give the American people bad news in one big jolt. He likes to parcel it out a little at a time in the manner he has done in regard to the Vietnam conflict. Last summer, it will be recalled, he permitted all kinds of stories to circulate about how he was preparing to declare a national emergency, call up the reserves, and greatly increase the draft call in order to meet our added commitments to Vietnam. Thus, when he took to the airwaves to announce that a troop buildup had become necessary but that it wouldn't yet require the declaration of a national emergency, calling up the reserves, or greatly increasing the draft call, the collective sighs of relief from our people just about obliterated the full significance of what the announced troop buildup would eventually demand in the way of extra money, extra manpower, and added risk.

Now the President is using the same soft-sell techniques with his new budget. By juggling figures, postponing tax cuts and creating the impression we can fight a war and still pour more money into the Great Society, he glosses over the bad news in his budget which is reflected in the fact that even the President cannot say he won't have to come back later and ask for new taxes to cover the profligate spending he has asked the Congress to approve.

South Vietnam and Social Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I fear that in our preoccupation with the mili-

tary aspects of the war in Vietnam, we have forgotten that we are dealing with what is essentially a revolutionary situation. The New York Post, in a perceptive editorial based on the experiences of one of its writers in the field, reminds us of the deep discontent that has made the Vietnamese people vulnerable to the penetration of the Vietcong. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent for permission to insert it into the RECORD.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 28, 1966]

FROM OUR MAN IN SAIGON

Post Columnist Pete Hamill's dispatches from Vietnam have given us all a more concrete and human understanding of somber Vietnamese realities.

His report yesterday brought into sharp focus the underlying frustration of the U.S. effort in Vietnam. Hamill's account of the Vietcong doctor who defected to the south only to discover that General Ky's officialdom will not permit him to practice medicine in an area starved for medical services led Hamill to a grim conclusion about South Vietnam's bureaucracy. It is a dreary lot and "we find ourselves as a nation defending the status quo in a situation that begs for revolution."

Hamill added: "In a country that is 90 percent agricultural, where 45 percent of the land is owned by 2 percent of the people, neither we nor our allies will ever whisper the words 'agrarian reform.'" Why?

U.S. spokesmen speak of "aggression from the north." Certainly Hanoi has fueled and fanned the flames of discontent in the south. But they may become a raging bonfire because of the inability or unwillingness of the privileged thin crust ruling Saigon to accept the view that governments exist for the benefit of their people. And this may be the heart of the problem we confront—larger than any debate over strategic military moves.

Federal Tax Plan Would Erode State Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Florida Times-Union, on the subject of proposed uniform tax systems set forth in H.R. 11798, entitled "Federal Tax Plans Will Erode State Powers." The editorial gives a clear, but disturbing picture of the effect of the proposed legislation in Florida and elsewhere. In this connection, attention is called to the fact that Florida State Comptroller Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., appeared Wednesday, February 2, before a House Judiciary Subcommittee in opposition to the measure.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL TAX PLAN WOULD ERODE STATE POWERS

The appearance of Florida's two top officials in the field of finance and taxation as protesting witnesses as congressional hearings tomorrow on a proposed uniform taxation system bears testimony to the justifiable concern with which Florida authorities view the scheme.

State Comptroller Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., will appear as spokesman for the State government, and will be accompanied in his presentation by State Revenue Commission Director J. Ed Straughn.

The bill purports to eliminate multiple taxation on businesses operating in several States by setting up a system requiring such firms to file a single report with the Federal Government, on the basis of which States concerned would collect taxes due.

In attempting to relieve a relatively small problem, however, the proposal would impose new and far more restrictive limitations on the taxing power of the States beyond those now accepted by the courts. It would make mandatory sweeping changes in State tax policies and practices, which officials estimate would cost Florida taxpayers about \$72 million a year. Finally, the bill is viewed with alarm by State officials as a further intrusion of Federal power into State affairs which would lead to the ultimate destruction of State fiscal sovereignty through imposition of Federal controls.

Under the bill, for example, States would be prohibited from imposing income taxes, capital stock taxes, and gross receipt taxes on out-of-State businesses operating within their borders unless their legislatures adopted the uniform tax system set up under it.

Governor Burns and the full cabinet have formally gone on record in opposition to the proposal, as has the interim State tax study commission headed by Senator B. C. Pearce, of Palatka.

The proposal is another notable example of using some ostensibly desirable reform as an appealing front to accomplish a purpose which the public would never willingly accept if advanced forthrightly.

If the present system for collecting State taxes on out-of-State businesses imposes undue hardships on such businesses, it should be relatively simple to provide relief without wrecking the system and imposing shackles on the States in the process. The provisions of the bill which extend beyond that stated purpose, however, support the strong suspicion that its real purpose is not to eliminate inconvenience to a limited number of businesses, but to drive another deep wedge to separate the States from the administration of their own affairs.

Message of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire country was reassured when its President expressed his view that this Nation and its people are strong enough to meet our commitments abroad and face up to our obligations at home at the same time.

In his state of the Union speech, President Johnson made an expression of confidence of the ability of this Nation.

The President said, quite simply:

I believe we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam.

The sweep of his domestic proposals was startling, the Houston Chronicle stated editorially.

The editorial, one of many in praise of the state of the Union message, will be of interest to my colleagues, and I offer it for the Record.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Johnson was eloquent in his state of the Union address last night although he offered the Nation no surprises in his assessment of the war in Vietnam. On the domestic front, however, the sweep of his proposals was startling. He has asked Congress for enough new legislation to keep its second session almost as busy as was the frantic first session. Those who expected a letup in the Great Society were put straight almost from the moment the President began to speak.

This was Mr. Johnson's first full-scale television address since early October. He appeared healthy and physically up to the occasion. His face seemed more deep-lined than usual perhaps. His demeanor was enthusiastic when he spoke of his domestic program; sober and measured when he spoke of Vietnam.

The Nation, perhaps, had hoped Mr. Johnson could reveal some dramatic new development in the Vietnam conflict. In that sense, his words were disappointing, for clearly nothing new has occurred since the beginning of his peace offensive to justify high hopes for a negotiated settlement. Instead, the President reiterated the now familiar U.S. stand—peace as soon as possible, but peace only after aggression is halted.

"Let me be absolutely clear," he said in one of his most dramatic passages. "The days may become months, and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle."

Mr. Johnson clearly has rejected the gun-or-butter choice which many have said has been forced on the country.

"We will not permit those who fire on us in Vietnam to win a victory over the desires and intentions of the American people. This Nation is mighty enough—its society healthy enough—its people strong enough—to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while building a Great Society at home."

Few had expected the President to be so ambitious in his request of Congress. In the field of civil rights, he was especially bold. He asked legislation to end discrimination in jury selection—a highly controversial issue; new laws to punish in Federal courts those who murder, attack, or intimidate civil rights workers; new legislation to ban racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. There will be a battle, surely, over these measures.

He asked, also, for a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation; for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; for development of a supersonic transport airplane to fly three times the speed of sound; for new measures to deal with strikes which threaten the national interest—this, incidentally, to considerable applause from Congress; for a new attack on river and stream pollution; for Federal highway safety legislation; and on and on.

In the foreign field, the President seeks a much needed "new and daring direction" to the foreign aid program and also an expansion of trade between this Nation and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The former will be welcomed, no doubt, but the latter will make the sparks fly.

And so will Mr. Johnson's proposal to increase taxes on telephone service and new cars—cut just 2 weeks ago. That increase would help finance the rising cost of the war, but it is evident that Mr. Johnson has no desire for widescale tax increases in this election year. He expects the Federal budget to rise to \$112.8 billion—the highest ever—but he intends to hold the deficit to a slim \$1.3 billion. If he can do this, he will surprise many doubting Thomases.

In sum, it was an ambitious, exciting domestic program which the President outlined, and a restrained, though straightforward appraisal of the future in Vietnam.

Bombs and Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made the only possible choice in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. The United States pursued every honorable means during the bombing lull in an effort to secure a cease-fire and the negotiation of a peaceful settlement.

We were answered with denunciations instead of negotiations.

As pointed out in the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1966, President Johnson has coupled the resumption of bombing raids with a further effort toward peace. I know his efforts will continue.

I commend the Tribune editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

BOMBS AND RESOLUTIONS

In announcing the resumption of bombing attacks on North Vietnam, President Johnson made it plain that this was the result of the considered judgment of the responsible military and political agencies of the American government. And that judgment can only be seriously contested on the assumption that the United States has no business in Vietnam at all.

For the bombing pause failed to produce any hint from Hanoi that it was willing to sit down at the conference table. It not only continued to insist on acceptance of its original four points (which would mean total victory for the Vietcong) but has added, as the British Foreign Office terms it, "a new and even more unacceptable prior condition"—recognition of the Vietcong as "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam."

Since Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war. No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice. But since it has been made so abundantly clear by the rejection of President Johnson's peace overtures, few Americans would want to endanger the lives of their men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

At the same time, the United States is fighting this war to end it, and the President has given renewed evidence of American determination in this respect by taking the case formally to the United Nations.

This has not been done before for several reasons. In the first place, the only international body which had been seized of the Vietnamese dispute was the Geneva conference of 1954. That body could be recalled to discuss the problem; the British Government, as one co-chairman, has been trying to do so. The Soviet Union, the other co-chairman, has refused.

There is also the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Red China, the power prodding Ho Chi Minh toward continued war, is a member of the U.N., and both have repeatedly and explicitly denied that the U.N. has any role to play in their affairs.

The American resolution, however, does not set forth specific terms for a settlement, or even outline fixed steps toward a settlement—which would almost certainly have brought immediate rejection by Hanoi. Rather, the American proposal would place the Security Council officially in back of a

February 2, 1966

According to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, Secretary Freeman is wrestling with the problem of a huge surplus of bureaucratic paper created by his own Department. It consists of 155,000 filing cabinets, valued at more than \$7 million and occupying about 18 acres of floor space. They contain "almost a million cubic feet of paper records" and, to say the least, "that is a lot of paper."

We do not know just how Secretary Freeman proposes to reduce this paper surplus. We are constrained to express the hope that it will not be done in some highly involved bureaucratic manner, that so typifies the Agriculture Department's operations, necessitating an increase in the number of employees.

There is already a surplus of employees with the Agriculture Department. They presently have 1 employee for every 32 farmers, whereas in 1933 there was 1 for every 203 farmers. I suppose we will now have a new division created in the Agriculture Department to dispose of the surplus paper records created by a surplus of employees.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the Wall Street Journal editorial:

EIGHTEEN ACRES OF PAPER

Announcing plans for what he calls a "cleansweep" campaign, Agriculture Secretary Freeman has disclosed that the farmers are not the only people who can produce surpluses. It seems the Agriculture Department has been creating a rather remarkable surplus of its own.

The targets of "cleansweep," says Mr. Freeman, are 155,000 Agriculture Department filing cabinets. The cabinets themselves are valued at more than \$7 million. They occupy 778,000 square feet of floor space, which is equal to about 18 acres. And they contain almost a million cubic feet of paper records. That is a lot of paper, and evidently a good bit of it is excess, for the object of the campaign is to eliminate 20 percent of the total.

We don't know exactly how the Department proposes to go about getting rid of its glut, but it's interesting to speculate that the agency might apply procedures it uses elsewhere. It might, for example, assign each of its many divisions a paper-acreage allotment and penalize those that exceed it. Or the Department might try direct payments to division chiefs who hold down their paper generation.

Perhaps such schemes might succeed. But given the usual bureaucratic ingenuity in paper production, they might not work any better in the files than they have on the farm.

Why the Reserves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly difficult to get all the facts concerning our situation in South Vietnam, but one fact is more than evident and that is that the enemy has greatly strengthened its position during the cessation of bombing by resupplying, regrouping, and bringing in additional

materiel which they could do without molestation.

This view is set forth in Joseph Alsop's column published in the Washington Post on February 2. Since he is on the ground in Saigon, his advice and report on the situation are all the more important.

His column follows:

WHY THE RESERVES?

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The reasons the President ought to be getting ready to call up the Reserves for the Vietnamese war are grimly simple. There are between 12 and 20 reasons already, and some more are probably on the way.

In brief, this country has now been invaded by a rock-bottom minimum of 12 North Vietnamese regular regiments, or the equivalent of 4 divisions of the North Vietnamese Army. This is not the official order of battle figure, to be sure, for that figure, so comforting to people in Washington, is generally about 14 months behind the harsh truth.

An invasion on a minimum scale of four division equivalents is the reading of much hard evidence by the Americans here who have been most nearly right in the past. There is a great deal of evidence, furthermore, not absolutely decisive but alarmingly persuasive, that the real total of invading North Vietnamese has now reached 15 regiments or 5 division equivalents.

Nor is that all. There is some evidence for the even higher total of 20 invading regiments, or close to 7 division equivalents of North Vietnamese. These last indications are pretty shadowy, as yet, but they deserve to be noted and weighed all the same.

In comparable situations in the past, unfortunately, the absolute maximum guess of the dimensions of the enemy buildup has usually, in the end, proved to be the correct guess. Furthermore, these acutely disturbing estimates of enemy strength "in country," as they say out here, are not the whole story, either.

Just north of the 17th parallel, on the very edge of the demilitarized zone, at least one additional North Vietnamese division is now in position. And if a second division has not moved up already, as seems most likely, it is quite certainly on the way and nearly in position. It may be added that the North Vietnamese have regularly been sending troops and cadres across the western end of the allegedly demilitarized zone for some time past.

Finally, the North Vietnamese have taken frenzied advantage of the bombing pause to accumulate very large forward stocks of military supplies on the border of the demilitarized zone. In this respect, the pause has been a golden boon to the enemy. Previously, there was no transport for such a buildup, since the most southerly provinces of North Vietnam had been under continuous attack for 8 full months.

When and if these consequences of the long pause hit the Marines at Phu Bai with painful force, as seems all too possible, it will be interesting to hear their reactions. Perhaps they will send a little round robin, beginning: "Thank you, Mr. President; thank you, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator FULBRIGHT; thank you, dear editors and analysts who have never set foot in Asia."

Such are the facts. They may be denied in Washington or even, on instruction, in Saigon, as such unpleasant facts have been denied in the past. But denials will not make them unfacts.

These are the facts, it should first be noted, primarily because the North Vietnamese Communist Government not merely called the reserves to the colors but also ordered general mobilization some time ago. Premobilization, the entire North Vietnam-

ese Army consisted of only five divisions, plus enough independent brigades and regiments to equal a bit more than five additional divisions.

Two of the original divisions, the 325th and the 308th, were sent South in tact when the decision was taken to invade South Vietnam with regular units. Since then, the units remaining in North Vietnam have been rather rapidly giving off additional regiments to join the southern invasion. Thus the army in the North approximately retains its original strength, less two divisions.

The meaning of these facts is also all too plain. The people who think the President has an option to keep this war cozily uncombative are talking through their hats.

The enemy has been rapidly escalating, to use these peoples' favorite word. Since there is no evidence that the North Vietnamese leaders are insane, it has to be assumed that the aim of this heavy and increasing invasion of South Vietnam by Communist regular units is, quite simply, to win control of South Vietnam by naked force of arms.

Thus far, the invasion has had no openly dramatic consequences, mainly because of a brilliant series of spoiling attacks mounted by General Westmoreland. But since the enemy's purpose is so abundantly plain, and since his buildup is so ominously heavy, President Johnson has only two options. He can get ready to retreat and to surrender. Or he can get ready to fight in earnest, in which case he has a clear duty to call up the Reserves.

Men Against the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Indianapolis Star of January 30, 1966, speaks well for itself.

I intend to introduce legislation requiring the Internal Revenue Service to grant to a delinquent taxpayer, against whose income levy is being made, an exemption to meet the indispensable needs to maintain life.

I do not believe any tax delinquent should, at the sufferance of the Government, drink champagne and play the ponies.

But, neither should he be denied daily bread. Those serving life prison terms are treated better than that.

MEN AGAINST THE WALL

Both the Federal and State laws making it possible to confiscate entire paychecks or seize all of a person's assets to collect overdue taxes are harsh and unreasonable. They are due for drastic revision.

The suicide of a 24-year-old auto plant worker with a wife and child, whose pay was confiscated by State authorities to satisfy tax bills, brings an evil situation into sharp focus.

It cannot be shrugged off justifiably with a cavalier excuse that taxpayers who go deeply into debt and are unable to meet their obligations on time simply got themselves into the fix and so deserved to be punished.

This is not to say that taxes should not be collected or that anyone obligated to pay them should not be forced by law to do so. Nor is it to say that solvency and fiscal re-

poverty and its effects can be marked only by area accomplishments.

The Economic Opportunity Act is founded on several significant purposes, one of which is to provide programs which will prepare our young people for the responsibilities of citizenship. One of the necessities of this preparation is the involvement of effective educational backgrounds for our citizens. With this necessity as its goal, the lighted schoolhouse project was undertaken in my home community of Rochester, N.Y.

I am pleased today to share a progress report on this project with my colleagues in Congress. The following article was published during adjournment in the November 1965, issue of Greater Rochester Commerce, the monthly publication of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce:

THE LIGHTED SCHOOLHOUSE PROJECT

The lighted schoolhouse project, sponsored by Action for a Better Community, Inc., the anti-poverty agency of the city of Rochester and Monroe County, held what amounted to a "crash program" in July and August.

Nicholas R. Milella, on loan from the city school district, and Sister Jamesetta, similarly on loan from the Catholic diocesan schools, are codirectors of the lighted schoolhouse project. The Reverend William M. Roche, superintendent of schools for the Catholic diocese, and Dr. Herman R. Goldberg, superintendent of the Rochester public schools, have given carte blanche invitations to use the resources of their staffs and facilities. Dr. Walter Cooper, Eastman Kodak Co., and Dr. Walter Liffon of the public school system—both interim directors of ABC, Inc.—encouraged and supported the fledgling project during the initial organizational stages.

The directors think that the teachers who received the nearly 1,000 boys and girls into public and parochial schools this September are finding the lighted schoolhouse students "abundantly better" in these specific ways.

(1) A greater feeling of security in his classroom—that school exists for him and that administrators and teachers are there to serve him.

(2) That he has a more aggressive attitude toward learning, for learning is an aggressive process.

(3) That he is unafraid, for fear may be an unsurmountable stumbling block to learning.

(4) That he has acquired a feeling of self-respect and worth as a person who can hope, dream, and plan for a decent future as his brother's equal.

(5) That he has caught on to the idea of involvement in school life, especially high school students—as so many find themselves worked out to the periphery of all the school's central activity. Once on the edge, these students have pretty much reached the point of no return and the next step is to fade out of school altogether.

Each center was staffed with a director, a guidance counselor, a speech therapist, a remedial reading teacher, a psychologist on call, music and art teachers, and the teaching staff to handle the basic instructional program.

From 300 applicants for teaching routines, 70 well-qualified persons were selected. To these about 25 volunteers, both professional and nonprofessional, were added. College and high school students who were free to serve in the summer program performed ably.

Aggregate daily attendance for the summer totaled 23,591. The total cost of staffing all centers this summer amounted to \$39,609—the cost per pupil for instructional staff for 8 weeks amounted to about \$1.69 per day. This low cost could not have been maintained if it had not been that nearly 5,000

hours of contributed services were rendered by volunteers. Cost for supplies averaged about \$2 per pupil for the entire session.

Sister Jamesetta, S.S.J., codirector of the lighted schoolhouse project, holds a Ph. D. degree in educational psychology. She came to the project from Nazareth Academy where she was principal of this all-girl high school of 1,500 students.

Mr. Milella, former principal of the Horace Mann School, No. 13, emphasized the wholehearted nonsectarian cooperation in the lighted schoolhouse project:

"The five major centers found welcome housing in the educational buildings of three Protestant churches, the top floor of one parochial school which was not being used, and in the area of three storefronts and the rooms to be found immediately above. All the centers are situated in the deprived neighborhoods as centrally as possible.

"The satellite centers, which were usually one- or two-room affairs, were used by primary children as the distance to a major center might prove too great for these children to attend safely. An abandoned concrete block building once used as a small printing establishment, a small house owned by St. Lucy's Catholic Church, the Sunday school rooms of the Atlantic Avenue Baptist Church, and the library room of the Genesee Settlement House were secured. In so selecting centers within the neighborhoods where the bulk of the target population was to be served, we adhered as closely as possible to the philosophy that the message must be taken to Garcia in as unpertentious manner as feasible.

"It must be said that in talking to the church ruling bodies or to the heads of social institutions for space to operate the lighted schoolhouse project, that Sister Jamesetta and myself were most warmly welcomed and shown every courtesy. It is most enlightening and heartwarming to note that people of all faiths joined in the effort to help the less fortunate. Each group we approached for help said in essence, 'Come and use us and what we have in ways that you see fit.' The giant force for good to be found represented in our great religious faiths are facing up to facts and are lending a most helpful hand in ways of contributing talent and material resources so as to aid in the fight to right the moral wrongs which have perpetrated upon such a large segment of our society."

Group guidance sessions helped the lighted schoolhouse students to sustain the idea that they could learn, to be loved, and have hope for a promising future; that learning did not take place because of fear of failure, but because of individualized instruction in which not knowing was not anything of which to be ashamed, and small successes received recognition.

Our Rochester community has benefitted by this well-executed summer program and is most grateful to the administrators, teachers, and all who were responsible for its helpfulness and obvious success.

firsthand of the accomplishments and needs of resource development throughout the area.

I wish to salute those farmers and ranchers in Kansas who make many sacrifices to serve as soil conservation district directors and to express the thanks of generations yet unborn to those who cooperate with the district in seeking the proper use and development of our rich resources of soil and water.

What these farmers and ranchers do in establishing conservation measures on their land benefits all landowners and operators.

The 15 counties in the Second District of Kansas are completely covered by soil conservation districts. District cooperators number 15,021 and own and operate more than 3.6 million acres of land.

They have installed about 34,000 miles of terracing, 10,000 farm ponds, 80,000 acres of grassed waterways. They have put 855,000 acres of range to proper use and converted 44,000 acres of cropland to grassland.

In addition, the local districts are extremely active in small watershed work under Public Law 566. Construction has been completed on two of the four projects approved for operations. These projects not only halt destructive floods but can also be developed for municipal water supplies, recreation, and agricultural water management.

Everyone within the water shed benefits—rural and urban interests alike.

For example, in the recently completed White Clay, Brewery, Whiskey Creeks project, both rural and urban land is protected. Before the project was installed, the city of Atchison stood in the shadow of damaging floods. Yearly flood damages in the watershed averaged \$260,000. One disastrous flood in 1958 took three lives and caused damages in excess of \$4 million.

Thanks to the new watershed project, this should never happen again. Last June, the project's effectiveness was tested during a 3.6-inch downpour and no damage occurred.

In addition to the four projects completed or under construction on 158,000 acres of land, six projects have been approved for planning assistance on 710,000 acres of land. There are an additional six applications on 378,000 acres awaiting action.

These projects are local undertakings. They are initiated and sponsored by local people through their soil conservation districts. I salute them for the work they are doing in conserving and developing our land and water resources.

Conservation Districts Spark Resource Development in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, while in Kansas during the month of January, I had the opportunity to take a conservation tour within my district and learn

Paper Surplus—18 Acres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, surplus farm commodities is not the only surplus problem confronting our Department of Agriculture.

RESOLUTION 236

Whereas the Florida Police Chiefs Association, Inc., do realize the very important place the children of this Nation play in the everyday function of our lives; and

Whereas the police departments throughout this great country are ever on the alert to warn parents and children alike on that great menace, the child molester; and

Whereas the St. Petersburg Police Department, with the great help of Mrs. A. C. "Pat" Hutchison and her charming child dummy "Yabby," who both joined the St. Petersburg police force, have been a great help in deterring this great menace to society; and

Whereas the above mentioned, with the help of the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs and many civic-minded people in the city of St. Petersburg, have been responsible in the production of the sound color film "The Riddle of the Friendly Stranger," which has become the most live teacher with impact: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Police Chiefs Association, Inc., at a regular board of directors meeting in the city of Cocoa Beach, Fla., on October 3, 1964, unanimously commend the above-mentioned organizations with a particular commendation to "Gabby" and "Pat" who have been such a great help to many law enforcement officers in the great State of Florida as well as the entire country, and the board of directors of this association do highly endorse this film in recognition of the worthwhile efforts of its cast.

WILLIS D. BOOTH, JR.,
President.

Attest:

KARL E. ENGEL, Secretary.

PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUNDHOG

(Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 2, at sunrise, the immortal Punxsutawney groundhog emerges from his lair on Gobbler's Knob. It is an important day, not only for Punxsutawney but for the entire Nation because what Mr. Groundhog encounters will determine the destiny of the Nation for the next 6 weeks.

If he sees his shadow, he will rapidly disappear into his burrow and we can then expect 6 more weeks of winter. But, if the groundhog fails to see his shadow he will frolic and enjoy his new emergence into the out-of-doors and winter will gradually disappear and warm and balmy spring weather will prevail.

This year after some effort, as is his custom, Mr. Groundhog appeared at sunrise and unfortunately his shadow was plainly visible and he did not remain very long in the outside world.

The people of Punxsutawney and vicinity rely heavily on the groundhog for this accurate weather forecast and natives say that it is an infallible weather vane. Business programs and many projects and activities are held off pending the arrival of Groundhog Day and the decision of the weather prophet.

Punxsutawney observes Groundhog Day fittingly and with great pride. A celebration is held, a civic banquet is staged, and all communications media in

the Nation give this remarkable occurrence tremendous publicity and recognition. But Mr. Groundhog takes it all in stride and calmly goes on about his business of the day. You see he is a very aristocratic animal, ever conscious of his lineage and shows that he is the only real true groundhog and that other imposters and fakers trying to assume his title are of inferior rank and should be ignored.

I am sure that all Members of the Congress join with me in extending best wishes and warm felicitations to that great city of Punxsutawney as they mark the passing of another year and the emergence from his den of their best friend—the Punxsutawney groundhog.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

POSTAL INSPECTORS LOOK AT MAIL SERVICE

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note that the Post Office Department has responded to my request for a probe of mail service throughout the Nation. I refer specifically to the news that more than 200 postal inspectors descended on the Nation's 72 largest post offices a week ago in an effort to determine the cause of delayed and misdirected mail.

While this is an excellent beginning, I only hope that these inspectors extend their activities into the rural areas of the Nation and take the time to hear the complaints of the people at large as well as the local postal officials who must labor under a system that was not of their own design.

I was particularly interested to note that the teams of postal inspectors, part of a 6-month task force study, are headed by A. C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General for Operations. That gentleman was in my office less than 2 weeks ago and assured me at that time that the Post Office Department intends to improve mail service across the entire Nation, including rural areas, following the current study. It is hoped that this probe of deteriorated mail service will result in positive proposals for restoring the postal service to at least the level of performance formerly enjoyed.

I would also hope that the people of the Nation will openly convey their problems and experiences to the postal inspectors when they visit. The views of the patron public are every bit as important as the views of the postal personnel and I hope the public view will be solicited by the inspection teams. And if given the chance, I certainly urge every person with a postal problem to speak up and be heard.

GUADALUPE MOUNTAIN—POTENTIAL NATIONAL PARK SITE

(Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was tending to business in my district and official committee business of inspecting the Guadalupe Mountain, potential national park site, near El Paso. As such I was unable to be present for rollcall No. 3 regarding House Committee on Un-American Activities. Had I been here, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "yea."

VIETNAM

(Mr. DICKINSON (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House Monday, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, called for a quarantine of North Vietnam. Certainly an embargo on all free world and other shipping to North Vietnam is imperative. American fathers, sons, husbands, and brothers are fighting and being killed in Vietnam. This was not the case when the late President Kennedy ordered the American Navy and Air Force to quarantine Communist Cuba.

Republicans support Mr. LAIRD's stand in favor of a quarantine of North Vietnam. I feel most strongly, however, that this should not be a partisan matter. It obviously damages our prestige in Asia if our Allies continue to ship vital materials to our Communist enemies in Vietnam.

It is amazing that British flag vessels are leading this parade of free world shipping since Australian Commonwealth troops are battling there along with our Americans. Moreover, as I have pointed out, we have cooperated fully in the embargo on Rhodesia in Africa and the least the British can do is reciprocate. No public call for such reciprocation has been made.

Now, according to the Washington Post, the latest Soviet MIG fighters, the MIG 21's, are turning up in Vietnam to oppose our bombings there. The Post asserts these shipments may have come by sea on Soviet ships arriving at North Vietnam ports.

May I also state that the failure to establish an embargo on even free world shipments to North Vietnam must raise a serious question as to the administration's wholeheartedness in conducting the Vietnam war. Are our beloved ones to risk their lives, and even die, in Vietnam because our friends trade with our enemies—and theirs?

In this connection, with unanimous consent, I introduce excerpts from an article in the Chicago Tribune by Walter Trohan, its distinguished chief Washington correspondent:

RUSK PERSISTS IN HIS VIEW OF ASIAN REDS AS AGRARIANS

WASHINGTON, January 30.—Once a Communist is identified as an agrarian reformer,

he remains an agrarian to Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Twenty years ago, when he was Assistant Chief of Security Affairs for the State Department, Rusk was one of the dedicated clique of appeasers in the State Department who believed that Mao Tse-tung and his followers were "agrarian reformers."

On January 21 this year an Australian reporter asked Rusk at his press conference whether he didn't think there is something incongruous in the fact that the British are shipping munitions and other materials to the Vietcong while Australians, who are part of the British Commonwealth, are fighting the Vietcong.

Rusk replied that he was not aware that any munitions were being supplied by ship to the Vietcong. Then he added that "free world shipping to North Vietnam has been very drastically reduced in the past several months."

NORTH VIETS PICTURED AS TRUCK GARDENERS

"We know that strategic materials are not moving into North Vietnam by ship," he continued. "Indeed, many of those free world ships go in empty in order to bring out fresh fruits and fresh vegetables and other products for other countries."

This would seem to make it clear that it is his idea that the Communist North Vietnamese, and very likely the Vietcong, are truck farmers and market gardeners.

At the Library of Congress it was reported that the principal vegetables grown in Vietnam are rice and sweet potatoes, for home consumption. Fruits are not listed as a major crop.

However, Mr. Rusk knows—as does every American—that the Communist North Vietnamese are sending bombs to the Vietcong which are being employed by them to kill Americans at the front in South Vietnam. It could be that he confused these "pine-apples" with fruit.

It would seem that Rusk doesn't know his fruit or Communist political applesauce. The Defense Department has reported that free world ships entered North Vietnamese ports in 1965. Rusk professes to believe all of these were under charter to Communist nations, but there is no law requiring free world nations to charter their ships for delivery of materials to kill Americans.

PHOSPHATE EXPORTS VALUED IN MILLIONS

Rusk said free world shipping to North Vietnam has been "cut very drastically." Yet his own information division reported on January 11 that total imports by North Vietnam were \$12,221,000 in 1964 and total exports, largely phosphates, were \$23,400,000. Both could go into the making of a lot of "pineapples."

Press Officer Robert J. McCloskey said on January 11: "Now a few of the countries involved are recipients of United States aid, and we are discussing this matter with them through diplomatic channels, which I have noted in the past: especially calling their attention to recently enacted amendments of the Foreign Assistance Act, which, in general and under certain conditions, provide for the termination of United States aid."

McCloskey estimated that there was a reduction of 60 percent in free world trade to North Vietnam in 1965.

One cent of trade from a recipient of foreign aid is too much, just as one drop of Communist applesauce in a Rusk press conference is too much.

CONTEMPT RESOLUTION

(Mr. WALKER of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today we are being called on to vote for a resolution citing for contempt several witnesses who failed to produce documents before the House Un-American Activities Committee relevant to the Ku Klux Klan investigation.

Certainly, those who fail to produce information demanded by a House investigating committee under a legal mandate, should receive proper punishment. To speak out against such a procedure would be as unwise as to speak out against our Nation itself. Such is not my purpose here today.

My objection to the resolution before this assembly does not question the right and perhaps the duty of Congress to recommend contempt proceedings for those who fail to produce relevant information before an investigating committee. Instead, the objection I raise goes to a broader issue—I question the value of citing these 7 men for contempt while our Government is at this very same instant allowing other persons, such as Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale, and his cohorts, to blatantly boast of their trip to Hanoi as self-styled peace negotiators for the United States. In direct defiance of the statutes promulgated by this body.

When I am convinced that the present investigation before the Un-American Activities Committee will be broadened to include investigations of such left-wing enemies of our Government as Professor Lynd and his crowd. I can wholeheartedly support appropriate legislation to punish those who fail to obey the legal mandates of this body's investigating committees.

On April 14, 1965, I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 336) which would authorize the necessary appropriation for an investigation of such radical un-American groups as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—SNCC, and Council of Federated Organizations—COFO, which are constantly demonstrating against our military effort in Vietnam as well as encouraging young men to avoid the draft. My resolution also included an investigation of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC, headed by the notorious Martin Luther King who recently stated on a nationwide television program that he should be able to choose which laws to obey and which laws not to obey. Such an investigation could be expanded to include Professor Lynd's group as well.

A number of my colleagues have seen fit to offer a motion to recommit the contempt resolution to a select committee to be named by the Speaker.

I do not believe this to be the proper course of action since, in my opinion, it would materially weaken the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Even though the alternative course is to support the contempt citation against the seven witnesses whom we were furnished no information whatsoever until we enter the House Chamber, it is our obligation to back the House Un-American Activities Committee in its recommendations. To do otherwise

would weaken its position when investigating our real enemies, the Communists and Communist-front organizations which are so detrimental to our way of life.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the pride which most American citizens have in our servicemen fighting in Vietnam is the following resolution passed by the Council of the City of Newark in the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. The members of the city council are certainly to be commended for their action in reassuring our troops that their sacrifices have not been forgotten. I include Resolution 65-88 of the City Council of Newark, Ohio, at this point:

RESOLUTION 65-88

Resolution commending the armed services of the United States for their participation in the defense of our country in Vietnam

Resolved by the Council of the City of Newark, State of Ohio (all members elected thereto concurring):

SECTION 1. That the armed services of the United States be, and they hereby are, commended for their defense of our country in Vietnam.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution expressing the appreciation of this council speaking for and on behalf of the citizens of the city of Newark, Ohio, shall be forthwith mailed by the clerk to the President of the United States, to the Congressmen serving this city and to all area servicemen in Vietnam and surrounding areas.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted the 20th day of December 1965.

ROBERT W. WORTMAN,
President of Council.

Attest:

DOROTHY A. HOUESHELL,
Clerk of Council.

Date approved by the mayor, December 21, 1965.

DAVID R. EVANS,
Mayor.

Approved as to form:

A. DAVID LIST,
City Solicitor.

Most American citizens will also agree, I am sure, that every effort humanly possible must be made to guarantee our men the supply of equipment, weapons, and food necessary to carry out their vital mission. Consequently, recent published information that the unloading of supplies in Vietnamese ports has been inadequate and long delayed and that responsible recommendations for expediting unloading operations have not been implemented give true cause for concern.

A news item from the New York Times of January 22, 1966, illustrates the seriousness of prevailing conditions. President Thomas Gleason, of the International Longshoremen's Association, after two trips to Saigon, is reported as being "truly disappointed" with the lack of progress made in correcting the situation

which he surveyed back in October of last year.

The columnist Victor Riesel, in a recent column, repeats the same theme; namely, that efforts by knowledgeable labor leaders to help correct present port conditions in Vietnam have been ignored.

In the hope that any necessary corrective measures are undertaken at once, I wish to call to the attention of my fellow Members the two above-mentioned items at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1966]
ILA CHIEF UPSET OVER SAIGON JAM—SAYS PROPOSALS TO CLEAR PORT HAVE BEEN PUT OFF

(By John P. Callahan)

Thomas W. Gleason, who has been to Saigon twice to break the bottleneck of mounting cargo and clear the congestion of inbound supply ships, said yesterday that he was disappointed over the delay in implementing suggestions for clearing the port.

"I guess it is the traditional impatience of Americans," Mr. Gleason, the president of the International Longshoremen's Association, remarked in a news conference in the union's headquarters, 17 Battery Place.

Mr. Gleason and four other senior longshoremen were in South Vietnam in September and again in December at the request of harried officials of the State Department and the Agency for International Development.

INFLUX OF SHIPS

Food and other civilian supplies are pouring in for a population, in Saigon alone, that rose from 1 to 3 million in the last few years Mr. Gleason said, and port facilities are inadequate. As a result of the influx of American merchant ships and the shortage of equipment and trained waterfront manpower, ships have been idle in the harbor of Saigon for as long as 3 weeks, before being unloaded.

Last October, after completing his first visit of 15 days, Mr. Gleason made several recommendations to the State Department. These included the opening of hiring halls (or employment centers) where dockworkers could be assigned efficiently to certain work areas. "This alone would have increased productivity by at least 25 percent," he said.

He also urged registering the 5,000 longshoremen in Saigon with a waterfront commission type of organization and assigning the men to definite shifts, both day and night. He said there was an extreme shortage of pier equipment such as hi-lo vehicles and other mechanized cargo-handling gear.

TRULY DISAPPOINTED

He also said that when he arrived in Saigon on his second visit last month, he was "truly disappointed that the report" submitted in October to the State Department after his first visit, "including recommendations, had not been carried out."

With Mr. Gleason during the news conference was George P. Delaney, State Department Coordinator of International Labor Affairs, who said that the Agency for International Development was "in agreement" with the recommendations made by Mr. Gleason.

Mr. Delaney also said that the equipment needed for efficient port operation in Saigon was on its way from various Asian ports, including Manila, Yokohama and Honolulu.

Mr. Gleason said that about 220,000 tons of cargo were handled each month in Saigon and that with an increase in efficiency, this figure could be increased to more than 600,000 tons.

"Unless conditions are improved in a hurry," Mr. Gleason declared, "the area faces the risk of inflation and food panic. We have every reason to assume that the com-

bined effort to the State Department and the Vietnam Government will avert such a situation."

U.S. OFFICIALS ARE ATTEMPTING TO CONCEAL VIET SUPPLY TIEUP

(By Victor Riesel)

A brass curtain has been lowered by Pentagon and State Department officials around the slow-motion Vietnam supply system.

The folds of that curtain are being used to gag union officials, who have learned of lethargy, lack of planning, corruption, and rule-book inefficiency now slowing the flow of equipment, weapons and food to our troops and allies.

Because of ancient Army regulations, millions of dollars are being wasted weekly. Cargo ships which should be speeding the oceans are idling at anchor. Seamen who could be working, and have volunteered and have been rejected, are stewing on hot decks in a steaming sun for 50 and 60 empty days at a stretch. And troops go without ammunition, food, and tools.

All this—and far more—has been learned by waterfront union leaders. But the Navy and the State Department this past week forbade them to report their findings to the public.

Since the Vietcong gets word of all this to Hanoi long before U.S. intelligence gets its reports to Washington, State Department and Pentagon brass obviously are seeking to withhold the story from the American public and from President Johnson himself.

Unloading of vital cargo in South Vietnamese ports is notoriously leisurely. Though several years ago it became obvious that huge supplies would have to pour into the mudbank bays and ports, the military did little planning. Even now slender women, weighing less than 100 pounds, carry 200 pound bags of cargo. Corruption is more rampant than malaria. But everybody says little can be done.

Result is that the Army uses its own longshoremen gangs to unload supplies. They are short handed. So they work one hatch at a time. But they can get help—and not from the South Vietnamese flesh peddlers, either.

Crews, belonging to the National Maritime Union (NMU), headed by Big Joe Curran, have offered to help empty the holds of ships they manned across the oceans.

Their assistance would be of gigantic help in solving problems on which the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) president, Ted Gleason, and four of his veteran ILA colleagues have been working in Saigon for over a month.

But the Army says no.

The military turns down the American seamen because the regulations say that no civilian shall unload the supplies.

Yet the American merchant sailors are doing nothing on deck. Their ships are held out in the harbor, or in Cam Ranh Bay or Qui Nhon Bay or as far as Manila. The vessels sometimes hang over, idle and fully loaded, for 50 or 60 days.

The longer it takes to unload these vessels, the longer the ever-arriving freighters must stay on the hook. This is costing the United States many millions of dollars. The Government must pay an average of \$5,000 a day for each ship while at sea. This is a charge under the charter arrangement. So if there are 50 or more ships idling in the harbor or bay for 50 or more days at some \$5,000 daily, it comes to somewhat more than the take on a charity bingo game night.

To take a first-hand look at the maze and mess, Joe Curran has dispatched two NMU officials to Saigon. With their experience they may yet show the military how to tow in World War II liberty ships, anchor them and turn them into waterborne tool ships and "reefer" vessels (refrigerator ships).

Thus as in the last big conflict, there could be fully equipped floating repair and assembly shops, mammoth floating ice boxes for perishable foods, floating warehouses into which the other freighters could empty their holds.

Then the ships need not idle for as long as a month. They could return for new, desperately needed cargo. And crews could be consolidated on those craft which must stay in the bays while skeleton crews take some freighters home. Some could be flown back to crew undermanned ships at this end.

It takes planning. There has been mighty little.

Small wonder the brass' curtain has been rung down on that corner of the China Sea.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF CIVIC ASSOCIATIONS SAYS THE DISTRICT'S POOR AREAS SUFFER IN MATTERS OF SNOW REMOVAL AND CLEANING AND BEAUTIFICATION

(Mr. WIDNALL, at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the poor areas in the District of Columbia suffer in the matter of snow removal, cleaning, and beautification, as a result of the District's concentration on its more affluent areas, according to Nelson C. Roots, the new president of the District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations. Mr. Roots told me today, and gave me permission to release this statement, that:

It appears that where most of the money is, most of the service and attention is given, and this applies across the board not only to snow but to services in general. Recently, an organization I headed had a meeting about this situation with an official of the Division of Sanitation and cited the real facts to him.

The District gives its best services to the areas where the economic potential is high, such as Georgetown, Cleveland Park, Spring Valley, Foxhall Road, and the Chevy Chase areas, especially west of Rock Creek Park. This can be substantiated, I believe.

The federation is trying to change this situation, but we are not having much success. It seems like it is going to be a slow process, one of education. It is the federation's position that if snow has to be removed it ought to be removed all over, and the District's low-income areas should be kept just as clean of snow and debris, and need just as much beautification, as any other area. It takes more cleaning in a poor area than in the affluent areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star today, in its society section, carries an article by Miss Betty Beale, its able and alert society writer, which substantiates the views of Mr. Roots. According to this Star article, a well-to-do citizen in the Cleveland Park area was able to have the snow removed from in front of his home in time for a party. This article was called to my attention by citizens who are of the opinion that the streets in front of the city's police and fire stations and public gathering places should be cleared before side streets are cleared of snow to enable a party to get underway.

A member of my staff reports that there were an overabundance of snow-

plows and attention on Foxhall Road on Monday and Tuesday, going over the same area again and again even though it had been cleared. Another member of my staff reported seeing at least 30 workmen in half a block on F Street on the same sidewalk, and getting into each other's way.

Thomas F. Airis, Director of the District's Department of Highways and Traffic, gave this excellent snow order the afternoon of February 1:

Bona fide emergency situations in addition to the approved programs will be specifically handled as emergency situations, but an attempt should be made to ascertain whether a bona fide emergency situation exists, otherwise it will be much better for the Highway Department to proceed on an areawide plowing basis without interference.

It may well be doubted that the situation described by Betty Beale in her column in the Evening Star of February 2 merited the special priority attention given it by Thomas F. Airis of the District's Department of Highways and Traffic. In fact, it seems to be completely out of step with the sensible policy laid down by Thomas F. Airis which I have quoted.

Officials of the Division of Sanitation have advised my office that they invariably give priority to bona fide cases involving safety of life and limb, and that a party such as that described by Miss Betty Beale would not qualify.

Included is the Evening Star article referred to above:

IRAN'S KHOSROVANIS FETED
(By Betty Beale)

"Charles de Gaulle never dined this well" said a guest at the Ralph Beckers' party last evening in honor of the Iranian Ambassador and Mrs. Khosrovani.

Close to 40 persons munched their way through the snow to attend a black-tie dinner prepared by the gourmet host, himself. And after they had tasted the lobster vol-au-vent, they knew the precarious trip to the Becker house had been worth it. That was before they had even sampled the fricandeau de vau that was covered with a superb sauce made with pate de foie gras and truffles.

The dinner also marked the unveiling of a collection of Persian artifacts which Becker acquired 3 months ago. With the help of the head of Near Eastern Art at the Freer Gallery, Dr. Richard Ettinghausen, Ralph bought the entire beautiful collection, that included pieces dating back 5,000 years, in a mere 30 minutes at the Hecht Co.

With the aid of Smithsonian experts, they've been beautifully mounted on lighted glass shelves in the library.

Setting on the shelves below the artifacts was a small, beautiful blue and gold china teapot which the patrician Mrs. Khosrovani took one look at and exclaimed:

"That's mine. That belongs to my family."

The two miniature portraits on the little pitcher were of members of the Qajar (Kajar) dynasty, which ruled Iran in the 19th century up until the beginning of the 20th century. The lovely looking Farah Khosrovani is a member of the Qajar family.

In his toast to the honor guests, Becker mentioned her discovery of the teapot and her connection with it, and he also revealed that the Ambassador is distantly related to the Aga Khan.

The dinner drew Kuwait Ambassador and Mrs. Al-Ghoussein, Moroccan Ambassador and Mrs. Laraki, the former ambassador to Iran, Raymond Hare (who is now assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern Affairs)

and Mrs. Hare; the two brothers-in-law who have served as ambassadors abroad and are now assigned to the State Department—Lewis Jones and Bob Woodward—and their wives; former Assistant Secretary of State and Mrs. Andrew Berding, Dr. Ettinghausen and his wife, who was wearing a 3,000-year-old necklace from ancient Amlash, Iran, made of bone and green glass; former Ambassador and Mrs. Jefferson Patterson, Mrs. John Farr Simmons, Mrs. Jouett Shouse and the Hunter Drums.

T. Graydon Upton, executive vice president of the Inter-American Development Bank, and his wife also were among the guests, as were Ali Khosropur of the World Bank and his good looking brunette wife, who is the daughter of one of Iran's greatest poets, Malik Ash-Shuara.

Dinner conversation revealed that the Beckers had left no stone unturned in preparing against every eventuality the weather might produce. They had arranged to have the street path widened in their block which took no little doing, since the majority of the city's snow-removing equipment was being used by private parking lots.

Before they succeeded in widening the paths, they had arranged for a bus to carry their guests from the nearest available parking space down the street to their house. And, finally, they had set up cots and sleeping bags to accommodate 22 persons in the event the new snow fall should prevent some of the guests' getting home. That is what you might call the black-tie emergency plan for the city that is annually never prepared for snow.

Washington beauties abounded at the dinner-dance given in honor of Chief of Protocol Lloyd Hand Monday night. Not the least of them was his own wife, but the dinner was not in her honor, because it was a birthday party for Lloyd. He reached the ripe age of 37 on Monday.

The party was given by Kuwait Ambassador and Mrs. Al-Ghoussein, and, despite the deep blanket of snow that everybody started out under, 29 of the 40 guests managed to get there.

The Hands, themselves, had to walk a mile from their McLean (Va.) home in boots and slacks, carrying their party clothes in suitcases, to change in town. They were astounded that so many guests showed up.

"I appreciated the fact that anyone would get out in that weather," he said.

Lloyd's sister, Bethlyn Hand, came all the way from California for the party and for the weekend to celebrate his birthday and her own. It seems their parents managed to have her born on January 30 and Lloyd on January 31.

The good-looking young women who sat at the four tables for eight in the decorative loggia of the new embassy on Tilden Street were the wives of presidential assistants, Congressmen and other men who figure on the Washington scene.

There was Moroccan Ambassador and Mrs. Laraki—she in a pink Parisian evening gown instead of her usual native Moroccan dress; Senator and Mrs. Frank Church; attractive Representative JOHN TUNNEY, of California, and the lovely looking, Dutch-born, blond Mrs. Tunney in a beautiful gold brocade evening dress; Texas Representative JACK BROOKS and his beauteous brunette, Charlotte; Florida Representative PAUL ROGERS and the lovely, fragile-faced Becky; Presidential Assistants Jack Valenti and Joe Califano and their good-looking respective spouses—Mary Margaret and Trudy; SCC Chairman Bill Henry and his chic Sherrye; Woody and Mary Ellen Woodward and World Bank Representative Omar Dajany and his pretty blond Betty.

Rita Tuzy, the Moroccan beauty whose husband is with the World Bank, came with-

out him as he was unable to get into Washington from the skiing resort where he spent the weekend. And Venezuelan Ambassador Enrique Tejera-Paris came without Pepita, who is expecting and was overtired after their weekend in Palm Beach as house guests of Marjorie Post.

Talaat Al-Ghoussein, the host, also was on that weekend in Palm Beach, but his very beautiful wife Bassima could not go because she was recuperating from her recent appendectomy.

No matter how great their effort to get there, looking at the puichitude around the room, the men must have felt it definitely worthwhile.

FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY

(Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 567) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the full and free interchange of views and information by agencies of the Government shaping fiscal and monetary policy. A companion measure (S. Con. Res. 73) has been introduced in the other body by the ranking Republican Member on the Joint Economic Committee, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

Senator JAVITS has presented a thorough and succinct analysis of the reasons for strengthening the coordination between the administration and the Federal Reserve Board. I agree with the views expressed by Senator JAVITS, and I would like to take this opportunity to re-emphasize and reiterate some of these points.

In our complex and dynamic economy it is mandatory that our fiscal and monetary policies be closely correlated. For this to occur, the Federal Reserve Board, which is our chief monetary authority, and the three agencies of the administration—the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers—which, along with the President, largely determine fiscal policy, must work hand-in-hand. I am in complete agreement with Senator JAVITS and several of my other colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee, including the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, who has introduced a similar resolution, that the present state of coordination and cooperation between these agencies is unsatisfactory.

This fact was brought to the forefront last December during the hearings the Joint Economic Committee held on the Federal Reserve Board's decision to increase the discount rate. One of the big questions was whether the Board had discussed its decision with the administration and whether as a general rule the Federal Reserve is in close contact with the administration.

The hearings showed that while the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board meets fairly regularly with the President and his economic advisers, there is little, if any, coordination between the other Federal Reserve Governors and the administration. This in itself indicates an immediate need for action to

improve the coordination procedure. With only one of the seven Board members on so-called speaking terms with the administration, it is hard to believe that the Fed's ultimate decisions can be fully coordinated with the Government's fiscal authorities. Beside this, any contact which the Fed Chairman does have with the President and the other members of the Quadriad, that is, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, is on a strictly informal basis, or, as Senator JAVITS put it, on an "I will take you out to lunch" basis—quote from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 28, 1966, page 1333. In fact, just this Monday, while testifying before the Joint Economic Committee on the Economic Report of the President, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, stated, in response to a question from the ranking House Republican, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], that the Quadriad had not met since December 6, even though the informal rules of the group call for a meeting every month.

The resolution which I introduced last week would set the record straight. It would present a clear formula for regular meetings and orderly procedures. Again, in the words of Senator JAVITS, it would put Congress on record as favoring:

First. Regular meetings—at least six times a year—of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Second. Procedures which would require key administration economic advisers to keep the Federal Reserve Chairman fully apprised of any development or information of which they are respectfully aware and which should be brought to the attention of the Board for the effective discharge of its responsibilities.

Third. Procedures requiring the Federal Reserve Chairman to keep all members of the Federal Reserve Board fully apprised of any information he receives from the executive branch which has relevance to the effective and informed exercise by the Board of its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that my resolution be given every consideration and that this body take speedy action in correcting an imperfection which has too long gone unnoticed.

WHO TOOK THE SILVER FROM THE SILVER LINING?

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, through the cloud of mystery that surrounds the administration's fancy footwork in juggling budget figures, there are at least two facts that shine through bright and clear: that Government spending and the national debt are increasing steadily and that we are not being told the whole story. I am introducing legislation today to assure the American peo-

ple that some of the money they are not hearing about—the profit from minting the new silverless coins—will be used to pay off the national debt.

The Treasury Department is manufacturing from one-fifth of 1 cent worth of metal, a coin which they sell for 10 cents. Even including the manufacturing expenses, the new dime costs less than a penny to produce. The new red-edged quarter costs a fraction over 2 cents and the new half dollar, which has some silver in it, costs just under 25 cents. That is a profit of 100 percent on half dollars and over 900 percent on quarters and dimes. I think we had all like to be able to turn that kind of a profit on a business.

The cost of the silver coins used to be about 95 percent of their face value, so the Treasury came out about even. But now, with costs a fraction of the selling price the Treasury will be turning over a tidy profit to the administration.

There are already 670 million of the new quarters in circulation, with a face value of \$167.5 million. The cost to the Treasury was only about \$13 million—a profit of just under \$154 million. And they have just begun.

The Treasury Department estimates that the net profit, or "seigniorage" on the new coins will be anywhere from \$1.5 billion to \$2.5 billion during 1966 and 1967.

Where in the budget did we see this new windfall for the administration? It was not emphasized. The President did not bother to mention that along with the money from reinstated excise taxes and faster tax collecting methods, he plans to make a tidy billion or two by giving us coins that do not jingle.

He did not point out that these Great Society programs were costing more than the deficit showed and that he was making up the difference with profits from this new money, which many people are now calling funny money.

Although the main profit is a one-shot revenue, it will be followed by an estimated \$200 to \$300 million a year. In addition, as the Treasury gets back worn-out silver coins, it can melt them down for about \$3.6 billion.

This tremendous one-shot profit, and the continued annual income of about a quarter-billion a year is not a windfall money to be used for the President's Great Society experiments. It is money that the American people deserve to hear about and get an accounting for.

Under the legislation I propose today, this money would be used to pay off the national debt, rather than be put in the hands of the Johnson administration's big spenders. It would require that all the "seigniorage"—profit from the new coins be applied to the retirement of the national debt.

This debt has climbed steadily under the heavy spending of the Kennedy-Johnson administration—Congress has raised the ceiling 10 times in those 6 years, from \$293 billion in 1960 to \$328 billion just last year. The cost in interest on this giant debt is now \$11.6 billion a year—over 11½ percent of the national budget.

It is time for the American taxpayer to demand a halt to this fiscal irresponsibility that is costing them so much. To the taxpayer, the Great Society's promises have been a costly disappointment—like its new coins, the silver lining has turned out to be copper.

POVERTY AND SECRECY

(Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the January 24, 1966, edition of the Washington Post points up very well the danger to the American people when Government "throws the cloak of secrecy over the expenditure of public funds and the distribution of public offices." The editorial refers to the Post Office Department's concealing the names of youths who worked in the Department during the summer of 1965 under a program described by the Post as "two-bit patronage peddling."

The Post editorial appropriately praises Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, for his efforts in obtaining public release of the names of these post office employees. I want to add my sincere thanks to my able colleague for his diligence in behalf of the public's right to know what its Government is doing.

The Post editorial follows:

POVERTY AND SECRECY

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, has performed a public service by obtaining the names of the youths who worked in the Post Office Department summer program. It discloses what everyone knew—that many of the jobs did not go to youths in need, as President Johnson had intended.

The impropriety of using these funds to pay off the friends and relatives of Congressmen and Senators is exceeded only by the cowardice responsible for the decision to conceal the names. This decision, moreover, has made suspect the allocation of jobs even when justifiable under the terms of the proposal.

The country ought to be alarmed by the power and the willingness of the Government to throw the cloak of secrecy over the expenditure of public funds and the distribution of public offices. If the citizens of a free country have any right at all to know about the operations of their own Government they have the right to know the names of those who occupy public offices paid for by their taxes. The funds here involved were not great but the incident gives thereby even more occasion for alarm because it suggests that a Department willing to employ secrecy to conceal such two-bit patronage peddling would exert even more effort to conceal larger flinagling.

BATTLEGROUND U.S.A.—THE ADMINISTRATION'S TRAGIC FAILURE EVEN TO SEE, LET ALONE DEFEND AGAINST, HO CHI MINH'S MOST DEADLY ATTACK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the civilians who manage the Vietnam war—the President, Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, and other top administration officials—appear to have made a deadly miscalculation as to the actual existence and location of one of the war's most crucial battlegrounds. As a consequence of this war mismanagement the enemy effort is prospering and Ho Chi Minh sees no reason at all to come to a peace table.

There is a way for a two-bit 10th rate country to beat a 1st-class major power and he knows what it is. Twelve years ago he won a war against a great power using it. His proven success—coupled with our failure even to see, let alone expose what he is up to and take action against it—is excellent reason for Ho Chi Minh's judgment that this time it will bring him victory again—and defeat the United States.

The administration—and, indeed, most Americans because they have not been told otherwise—seem to believe the Vietnam war is being fought exclusively in Asia, halfway around the world. True, the bloody battles are being fought there, but equally critical and important enemy offensives are being mounted right here at home on battleground U.S.A.

Ho Chi Minh won his previous war against a great power on battleground France. That country was not brought to its knees in humiliating defeat at Dienbienphu in 1954, but far away in the homes and hearts of Frenchmen. In the cities and on the farms of France that nation's will was broken to continue its resistance to Communist takeover of the Far East. The defeat of French military forces at Dienbienphu was serious—but France still had the resources and capability to rally and pursue Ho Chi Minh to his destruction. She lacked the will to do so. That will was undermined and broken by a clever enemy. Instead, France used the military misfortune as an excuse to pull out and ignominiously abandon to others the free world need and responsibility to halt expansion of the Bamboo Curtain.

In the end, Ho Chi Minh's fifth column in France proved more powerful and more decisive than his guerilla columns in Asia. His clever and determined psychological war against the French on their own soil utilized many allies. The French Communist Party and all its well-oiled apparatus went into action. Front groups sponsored public demonstrations against "the fighting and the killing and the horror." Families of French soldiers away fighting were harassed. Ample funds were supplied to publicize and lionize the speeches and writings of dupes attracted to the cause "in humanity's name." Leftist and liberal newspaper columns hammered away at the "Asia for Asians" theme. Opportunistic and "bleeding heart" politicians jumped on the antiwar bandwagon. Step by deliberate step French public opinion was manipulated first to question, then to doubt, then to oppose France's resistance to Communist demands she get out and surrender this strategic part of the world to them.

What we see around us in the United States today adds up to a recognizably

familiar pattern to anyone who watched the will of France falter and disintegrate a dozen years ago. There are the peace placards, parades and demonstrations, the antiwar speeches and pamphlets, the defeatist intellectual discussions. We hear of the "futility of American boys dying in the jungle." We see the pitiful pictures of Vietnamese women and children captioned "poor peasants who seek only peace and freedom cruelly killed and maimed." There are hints of murderous sadism amongst troops who "mercilessly bomb, mortar, and burn" the "huts and villages" of "blameless bystanders who only want to be let alone." There are expressions of pious fear that "American policy" is "misguided," and that "nothing in this distant, backward land possibly could be worth the life of even one American boy." There are known, little known, and unknown committees and individuals—in and out of office—beating a steady drum for negotiation even in the face of the enemy's contemptuous refusal to consider doing so.

Whether those who carry on these activities—and those who are their targets—know it or not, all this is just as much a part of the Vietnam war as the attacks with guns, mortars, and plastic explosives against American forces in uniform in Vietnam itself. It is just as much an integral part of Ho Chi Minh's aggression now as it was at an earlier time in France when and where he employed the same strategy and tactics of psychological war to vanquish a large, rich, and powerful country.

Yet who in the administration has explicitly told the American people of this battle against them in their midst? President Johnson has not. Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk have not. Vice President HUMPHREY and other administration leaders have not. Instead they have dignified the defeatists and legitimized them by carrying on a solemn and sustained dialog with them. Are these leaders not wise enough to see that the enemy is using a proven technique? Do they see, but ignore its potency? Are they so naive they do not recognize this as one of the important ways Communists wage war? Do they not see a need to defend against it? Their condescending toleration of the "Vietniks," demonstrators, and defeatists and the propaganda they spew fails to indicate satisfactory answers to these questions.

If our national purpose is to avoid indignity, dishonor, and defeat at the hands of a 10th-rate aggressor and to preserve the vital interests of the United States and of freedom in Asia—as we did by fighting World War II in the Pacific and the Korean war—then the highest officials of our Government who are running the current war must come to realize where one of its most crucial battlegrounds is. They must make universally known just exactly what the enemy is up to in our very midst—and why and how—and enlist the aid of every patriotic citizen in a counterattack against the insidious assault being made right here in the United States upon American will, resolve, and morale.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE GROWING MENACE OF DRUG ADDICTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, early in the 39th Congress I introduced four bills dealing with the acute problem of narcotics addiction. This legislation reflects a long-standing and profound concern. For several years now I have been sponsoring legislation on this matter; the four measures I now advocate were substantially revised in order to incorporate numerous important recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse.

Last July I was privileged to appear before our Judiciary Committee in support of major new laws in this field.

The objectives of my four bills are to provide more research, greater financial assistance, expanded facilities, reformed treatment, and better law enforcement.

Addiction cannot be cured, nor can law enforcement be perfected, without a comprehensive program directed toward better treatment as well as the tragic criminal repercussions among youth. Today we still lack that intelligible combination. Without it, I fear that all other disparate efforts, however well-intentioned, will fail to stem the ominous trend.

Recently, Mr. Leonard Victor undertook an intensive investigation of the addiction problem among youth on Long Island, N.Y. His very cogent survey led to a series of articles appearing in the Long Island Daily Press. Mr. Victor's keen insight into the complex circumstances of juvenile addiction serve to illuminate this whole, tragic situation.

So that Members may acquaint themselves fully with the many elements of this problem, I include Mr. Leonard Victor's articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Long Island Press, Jan. 4, 1966]
 KIDS FROM FINE FAMILIES AMONG THOUSANDS
 HOOKED

(By Leonard Victor)

"Where will you be 5 years from now?"
 "Dead I hope."

The goodlooking 19-year-old who gave me that answer is a drug addict. A prostitute too, to support her drug habit.

She's not from the slums of Harlem or Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Her part-time home is still her parents' beautiful house in Roslyn. So far, her very respectable mother and father don't even know she's a week-end "hustler."

I talked to dozens of other young addicts from equally fine homes as I traced a deadly new wave of drug, narcotics, and marijuana addiction across Long Island.

They all came from the "good addresses" in Forest Hills, Great Neck, Huntington, Lawrence and Hollis—not the slums.

In conventional mortgages, the interest rate fluctuates with money markets. Therefore, conventional mortgages are usually at par (lenders pay 100 or give the full face amount of the mortgage).

By regulation of the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration the buyer cannot pay the points or discount. Therefore it must be paid by the seller or owner. A property owner can avoid the problem (and save money) by instructing his broker to sell on a conventional mortgage basis if at all possible.

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A VERY LAUDABLE "FIRST"

(Mr. BURTON of California (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Sun Reporter in its January 22, 1966, issue ran an editorial entitled, "A Very Laudable 'First.'" The editorial commends the President's appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

I have early expressed my pleasure over the appointment of this outstanding man and at this time place the full text of the editorial in the RECORD:

A VERY LAUDABLE "FIRST"

The pledge, given by President John F. Kennedy, that a Negro would be named to the President's Cabinet, was fulfilled this week in the appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver. The appointment is historic and cogent, carrying with it the greatest significance for our domestic economy and the broadest ramifications toward the solution of the Nation's frustrating housing problems.

Dr. Weaver, the first Negro Cabinet member and first Secretary of the newly created Housing and Urban Development organization, has before him a monumental task. President Johnson, himself noted for taking monumental tasks in stride, grinning at Weaver during his press conference, said, "May the good Lord have mercy on you." Weaver returned the grin, an expression of solid satisfaction in having attained this high point of his ambitions in Government and politics.

Dr. Weaver's qualifications overshadowed those of 300 names submitted to President Johnson as candidates. Following Weaver's nomination the Senate speedily confirmed his appointment by unanimous voice vote.

Fresh out of Harvard with two degrees in 1933, Weaver went to work under Harold L. Ickes in the Department of the Interior. He earned his doctor's degree in economics from Harvard in 1934, then worked as a special assistant in the Federal Housing Authority from 1934-37, 1937-40 and with the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission during World War II. After the war he taught at Columbia and New York Universities. Dr. Weaver established another "first" when New York Gov. Averell Harriman selected him as the first Negro to sit in a New York Governor's cabinet. His position was that of State rent administrator.

Dr. Weaver's trek to Cabinet rank began 5 years ago when President Kennedy ap-

pointed him Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Twice during that period Weaver was denied the Cabinet position because Congress, strengthened by opposition from southern Congressmen, refused Kennedy's request for establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, to be headed by Weaver. Last year Congress finally authorized the plan.

Meanwhile, Weaver had given further and impressive evidence of his qualifications. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, who voted against Weaver when he was named Federal Housing Administrator, said the other day, "Although I thought he was going to be prejudiced, I have seen no evidence of prejudice." Democratic and Republican Members of Congress vied in praise of Weaver and his record.

As head of the new Department, Dr. Weaver would receive \$35,000 annually, an increase of \$5,000 over his HHFA salary. He will be in charge of overseeing multibillion-dollar operations in low-rent public housing, community facilities, mass transportation, slum clearance, and a staggering variety of other Federal programs, many of them new. His job will continue to be one of the most difficult and frustrating in the Federal bureaucracy. This includes establishing some authority over a vast assemblage of special interest groups, all of them competing for special attention or funds. These include the mayors of our cities, the homebuilders, the real estate agents, and the bankers who lend money, the planners, and various minority groups.

Negroes are proud of Dr. Weaver's appointment, and equally proud that he so adroitly fought for this position. He most earnestly desired it and reportedly turned down two very attractive academic job offers while impatiently awaiting action on his appointment by the White House.

One of the most hoped for changes in the housing picture is a new approach to slum clearance, which will give responsible consideration to reasonable compensation and humane resettlement of those dispossessed by the clearance program.

The President, Members of Congress, and the vast and complicated agencies and departments, all deeply concerned with housing, are now convinced that Dr. Weaver can do the job. America is indeed fortunate in having a completely dedicated official at the head of the agency which concerns the very heart of our Nation—the homes of America. Negroes have a new confidence and a new pride in this new member of the President's official family.

THE PRESIDENT'S CLEAR DUTY

(Mr. CALLAN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President announced that he was forced to resume the bombing attacks on North Vietnam. This was an agonizing decision, as is well known. That it was a decision he fervently sought to avoid has been well demonstrated by the withholding of these attacks while he sought an alternative way to peace.

It has now been well documented throughout the world that the President has sought every opportunity to persuade the enemy to meet with us and discuss the issues in Vietnam. It has been equally well documented that these efforts have met with naught but hostile rejection.

There appears in yesterday's Wash-

ington Evening Star an editorial which sums up the background of the President's decision and touches upon the doubtful contribution of those who have criticized it. The editorial declares that there "should be an end to aimless speeches and protests which serve no better purpose than to undermine the President and to encourage the enemy."

This is a sentiment in which many of us in this House concur. I have asked consent, therefore, to have the entire text of this editorial printed in the RECORD where all may read it; and it follows herewith:

HIS CLEAR DUTY

In deciding to order a resumption of bombing of military targets in North Vietnam, Mr. Johnson did what had to be done. As President and as Commander in Chief, conscientious of his responsibility to some 200,000 American troops as well as the soldiers of our allies, who are under attack by a relentless foe, he could not have done otherwise.

Obviously, it was not an easy decision to make. And the President, even while giving the order for the bombers to take off, renewed his pledge that the search for a just settlement will go on. One aspect of the quest is the arbitration proposal which Ambassador Goldberg has put before the U.N. Security Council. There is no occasion, however, for soaring hopes on this score. During the bombing pause, which lasted for 37 days, the Communists not only pressed ahead with the fighting; they also used the opportunity to redeploy their soldiers, bring up supplies, and repair the damage done to their transportation system. To have permitted this to go on indefinitely, as some urged, could only have resulted in heavier American and allied casualties. To his credit, his critics notwithstanding, the President was unwilling to pay this price. As he put it, it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the casualty rolls which, in any event, will be long.

What is to be said of the critics, especially those in the Senate?

In 1776 Thomas Paine wrote that "these are the times that try men's souls." He also paid his respects to "the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot" who, in the crisis of that day, shrank from the demands of the war for freedom. If Paine were living now he might have something to say about sunshine Senators.

It is not our purpose to be invidious in suggesting this. But last week's spectacle in the Senate was nothing less than astonishing.

In the course of a 4-hour grilling of Secretary of State Rusk, one Senator after another came forward to wring his hands. Senator FULBRIGHT couldn't recall any issue about which there is so much apprehension. Pennsylvania's Senator CLARK was scared to death that we are on the way to world war III. Senator MUNDT offered the profound observation that there is a developing uncertainty among the American people "about what this is all about." (Little wonder, if the people have been listening to the senatorial critics.)

One theme which runs through the criticism is that Congress, when it approved in 1964 a joint resolution supporting the President's policies, did not quite realize what it was all about, didn't quite intend to authorize the President to do precisely what he now is doing. Yet the language of the resolution is unambiguous. It puts Congress squarely on record as authorizing the President, as he may determine, "to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force," to assist South Vietnam in defense of its freedom. Pretty hard to wriggle out of an endorsement like that.

Senator MOSS was one of two Members of Congress who voted against the resolution.

February 2, 1966

1763

equipment that could be used in disaster work. In response to local requests for assistance, generator sets were obtained and distributed to provide emergency power in stricken areas and high-capacity pumps were acquired and installed to pump out impounded floodwaters. In addition, large dredges and pump barges were obtained by the corps and deployed to assist in pumping flooded areas dry. Emergency base radio stations were also installed in southeast Louisiana to provide temporary communications until normal communications could be restored.

In the immediate posthurricane period, corps personnel in New Orleans began negotiating with contractors for removal of debris from streets, highways and other public facilities and areas, and for supplies and equipment essential to rehabilitation work. According to the record, 118 contracts were entered into in rapid succession. Within an almost unbelievably short time contractors' dump trucks, with capacities up to 15 tons, were moving in a near endless line hauling debris to dumps for burning. Over 1,500 trucks with mechanical sawing equipment and loading devices were used in this operation. At the same time broken limbs were being removed from trees by trimming crews so as to eliminate public safety hazards. In many areas this work augmented that of local agencies and soon all local traffic arteries were opened and in use.

An official of the city of New Orleans had estimated that it would take a year to accomplish this and clean up the city. This was accomplished in some 2 months. All in all, corps contractors removed and disposed of some 223,800 truck loads of debris throughout Louisiana. Additionally, houses that had been blown or washed onto roads were removed and drainage facilities impaired by Hurricane Betsy restored.

Buildings in the New Orleans area rendered structurally unsafe by the hurricane were demolished while individual trailer sites and parks were being constructed to receive G.S.A. trailers supplied for those residents left homeless by the storm.

At the same time the Corps of Engineers contracted for marsh cranes for local agencies to use in cleaning out canals and other facilities. They also assisted local interests by furnishing men, material, and equipment as necessary to make emergency repairs to damaged local levees in the vicinity of New Orleans and areas to the south. Corps of Engineer crews also reinforced local interest levees elsewhere with sandbags so as to provide immediate interim protection and in one area constructed a 420-foot emergency levee setback opposite a damaged local levee.

The same hurricane-induced tidal surges that wreaked havoc on the land mass of southeast Louisiana also exacted a heavy toll from the marine industry. Many vessels, ranging from small fishing boats and pleasure craft to oceangoing vessels, were torn from their moorings and sunk. Some 176 others were grounded on the banks and levees of the Mississippi River by the rise and fall of the tidal surges. Following the passage of Hurricane Betsy, the Corps of Engineers began a detailed survey of navigable channels in the interest of determining obstructions to navigation and delineating clear channels. This work was rapidly and effectively accomplished and marine traffic quickly began moving safely out of and into the ports of New Orleans and Baton Rouge. Investigations into the ownership of grounded vessels were conducted and 142 of these vessels have been removed by their owners under the direction of the Corps of Engineers.

The marine loss of barge MTC-602 in the Mississippi River at Baton Rouge, La., presented the most serious potential of any

marine loss resulting from Betsy. This barge, loaded with 600 tons of liquid chlorine, had been moored in Baton Rouge prior to the hurricane. On September 11 this barge was reported lost and presumably sunk. The Corps of Engineers immediately established an emergency operations center in the area to begin a search for the barge. The 4th Army, Navy, and Coast Guard were also engaged in the operation. The Office of Emergency Planning subsequently directed the Corps of Engineers to coordinate search efforts for the barge and remove it when located as a hazard to public safety. Some 16 submerged objects were located and buoyed during the search. On September 16 a Corps of Engineers survey boat, on which was mounted a Honeywell precision profiling sonar system, loaned to the United States by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., of Houston, located MTC-602 lying sunk in 60 feet of water.

The corps immediately undertook a detailed survey of the barge, utilizing divers and underwater survey equipment. Its exact positioning and condition were determined. Simultaneously, a study was made into the construction features, strength, and condition of the barge. Utilizing the information gained from the surveys and study, the corps negotiated a contract for removal of the barge. Plans of the contractor were reviewed in detail. Following approval by the corps, work preliminary to actual lifting operations was begun under corps supervision. This necessarily slow and detailed work was completed on November 11. At 8 a.m., on November 12 lifting operations were started. Within 2 hours the barge broke the surface of the water. The mission had been carried out by the Corps of Engineers without flaw. The fear and anxiety which had gripped the populace of Baton Rouge, La., and much of the Nation disappeared with this accomplishment.

Over the years the Corps of Engineers has constructed levees and flood control structures in the lower Mississippi Valley to protect the area from devastating floods. That these flood control structures were well and properly constructed is now well established. Despite being overtopped by Betsy's tidal surges and having vessels, houses and other debris cast upon them, the levees held. Many of them, however, were seriously damaged. Along with other emergency work, the corps has undertaken rapid restoration of all Federal levees so as to provide full protection in the event of a coming high water. Additionally, the Corps of Engineers has and is busily engaged in restoring locally constructed levees to their prehurricane condition so as to protect from flooding from the rear.

Throughout Hurricane Betsy operations the Corps of Engineers has devoted maximum effort toward assisting, coordinating and cooperating with local, parish, State and Federal agencies and the public at large. At the same time every effort has been toward protecting the best interests of the United States.

POINTERS ON MORTGAGE POINTS— BANKS PROFIT FROM FED'S TIGHT MORTGAGE MONEY MARKET

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve action last December, raising the discount rate and regulation Q, has been defended as a tool for restraining inflation. As the months go by, this

uncalled for action is proving to be a heavy burden for the individual taxpayer and citizen.

Last December, Mr. Speaker, I warned of the dire effects that would result from the Fed's action in forcing a rise in interest rates. Saturday's Washington Post has an interesting article pointing out the ensuing hardships that higher interest rates have forced upon the new homeowner.

Since the money market is so very tight, due to the Federal Reserve actions, mortgage loans are more costly. As we can see from this article, even the fixed FHA and VA mortgages do not remain fixed, but are subject to "points" or discounts. Lenders, banks, savings institutions, and insurance companies, offer less than the 100 percent for these FHA and VA mortgages meaning that the homeowner must pay more for his mortgage, even if the rates are guaranteed stable by the FHA and VA.

Legally, these two agencies cannot pay these points or discounts on mortgages, so that it must be passed on to the homeowner or seller. The penalty has been passed to those who can least afford to pay.

Instead of halting inflation, the Fed has hit the small homeowner with a stinging penalty and offered the banks an opportunity to get richer. Again we see the Fed's efforts are directed more to help the moneylending banks than to help the homeowners public.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 29, 1966]

POINTERS ON MORTGAGED "POINTS"

(By Bernard C. Meltzer)

Recently, the Federal Reserve Bank raised the bank discount rate by one-half of 1 percent. Overnight, property owners then found themselves required to pay extra sums in points or discounts when they sold. Many have written asking for an explanation of this development in real estate.

"Dear Mr. Meltzer: The constant topic in the monthly meetings of our civic group used to be taxes and schools. Now it's points and discounts on mortgages. One property owner told of being charged 5 percent or \$1,000 on a \$20,000 mortgage obtained by the buyer.

"This is something new. We would like to know what suddenly has brought about this situation. Second, would you please explain why banks and real estate brokers all of a sudden have decided to get rich at the expense of property owners?"

"ASKING."

Answer. A property owner will not sell his house for \$15,000 if similar houses in the area are bringing \$20,000. A bank, likewise, will not sell its money (mortgages) at 5½ percent when the market rate is 5 percent. The recent action of the Federal Reserve bank raising discount rates by one-half percent has suddenly caused a change in mortgage interest rates and emphasized the phenomena of points and discounts.

FHA and VA mortgages have fixed interest rates (now 5½ percent). If the money market rate is higher than the FHA or VA fixed rate, lenders offer less than 100 for these mortgages or buy at a discount. A 5 percent discount (or 5 points) means that mortgage lenders pay \$9,500 for a \$10,000 mortgage. In this way the market rate adjusts to the fixed rate of the FHA or VA mortgage.

So he at least is entitled to be heard as he protests now. The Oregon Senator has been intemperate, even savage, in his criticism of the President. But he is also the only one to come forward with a proposal which goes beyond mere handwringing. The 1964 resolution provides that Congress may terminate it by another joint resolution, and Senator Morse urges that this be done.

Perhaps this should be brought to a test. Let us find out how many Members of Congress, in the face of Ho Chi Minh's adamant refusal to discuss peace except on his own terms, would vote to rescind the authority previously given the President. Let us find out what those who might vote for revocation propose to do about the war, about the 200,000 American troops who are fighting the battle, and whether they intend to waltz on our Nation's commitment to a free choice for South Vietnam.

Our guess is that such a resolution could not muster a corporal's guard in Congress. If this is so, there should be an end to aimless speeches and protests which serve no better purpose than to undermine the President and to encourage the enemy.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's foreign aid message this week emphasizes the obvious need for an increased foreign aid program in Vietnam. But the President also points out that we cannot let Vietnam obscure from our vision other programs of equal importance elsewhere in the world.

Among those other programs is the Alliance for Progress with our friends in Latin America.

The President's request for funds for the Alliance in fiscal year 1967 is \$543 million. This is some \$13 million more than was appropriated for fiscal 1966. It represents one of the best investments the United States can make today.

For through the Alliance for Progress we have given notice that we will fight the hunger and illiteracy, the disease and deprivation, which are the conditions of life for so many in this half of the world. We have linked our own energies and resources to the aspirations and determination of the men and women in Latin America who are striving to bring better lives to their people and to maintain peace in this hemisphere. By lending a further hand to peaceful development, we weaken those who, like Castro in Cuba, would turn legitimate demand for change into violent upheaval.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

The Alliance stands for economic and social progress—for the dignity of man.

This Alliance is little more than 4 years old. In that time: 300,000 new houses have been built or are under construction; 9,000 miles of road have been built, expanded or improved; 10 million new school books have been provided; 13 million schoolchildren now participate in school lunch programs, with 12 million adults benefiting from regular food shipments; hundreds of thousands of Latin Americans can now find relief from suffering in 850 hospitals, health centers

and mobile medical units added under the Alliance; more than 100 million people are now protected against malaria.

SCHOOL AND HOUSES

In some nations, more schools or houses have been built since the Alliance began, just over 4 years ago, than were built in the past 200 or 300 years. Cooperatives and loan associations are enabling borrowers, for the first time, to obtain credit or capital at reasonable rates. In many areas, children are not receiving better textbooks: they are receiving their first books of any kind.

LATIN AMERICANS HELP THEMSELVES

What have the Latin Americans, in those 4 years, done to help themselves?

All of the 19 Latin American nations have improved their administration of taxes, and 14 of them have produced major tax reforms.

Fourteen countries have instituted or speeded up land reforms.

Fifteen countries have established self-help housing programs.

Nine countries have enacted laws favoring growth of savings and loan associations.

Eight countries have new private and public development banks.

In the past 3 years, the Latin American nations have allocated about \$8 billion of their own resources each year to development programs, and this amount is expected to reach \$12 billion shortly.

They have increased education budgets by 13 percent.

A 5-nation bloc in Central America has established a common market which has made dramatic economic progress, experiencing economic growth at the high rate of 7 percent per year.

These changes did not just happen. They came about because men of vision and practicality instituted them, both here and in our neighboring nations to the south.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to paint an easy or rosy picture, for there is still an immense amount to be done if the peoples of Latin America are to continue to make progress. The way ahead will not be easy and it will not be without difficulties and failures.

Yet it is clear this joint effort must go on. And to continue this effort toward the development of a strong, peaceful, free, and democratic hemisphere, I believe that we in Congress must lend our support to the request which the President has made for adequate funds for the Alliance for Progress.

We are no longer faced with the question of whether the Alliance will work or not. It is working. Our task now is to continue it, to strengthen it, and to move with its gathering momentum.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the International Education Act of 1966.

During the 88th and 89th Congresses, we have immensely strengthened this country's commitment to the enterprise of education.

Yet as President Johnson said in his message to Congress today in connection with the International Education and Health Acts of 1966:

We would be shortsighted to confine our vision to this Nation's shorelines. The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and scourge of disease.

In his message, President Johnson indicated his strong support of four major purposes in international education:

1. To strengthen our capacity for international cooperation in the field of education.
2. To encourage exchanges with students and teachers of other countries.
3. To lend support to education in the developing lands.
4. To construct new bridges of international understanding.

Mr. Speaker, the President is proposing a series of measures to achieve these several purposes. The legislation I am today introducing is aimed at only two specific objectives: First, supporting programs of international scope in smaller and developing countries; and second, strengthening centers of special competence in international research and training.

Mr. Speaker, like a number of my colleagues, I have had the good fortune to visit many schools, colleges, and universities here in our own country as well as abroad—in Buenos Aires and Berlin, Moscow and Djakarta, Oxford and Warsaw.

In 1961 as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I went with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAMOL], to Argentina for the purpose of studying the contributions which Latin American universities could make to the Alliance for Progress, and on our return we published a report with a number of recommendations for U.S. aid policy to higher education in Latin America.

During the same year, along with several other colleagues, led by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], I had the valuable experience of visiting schools, colleges, and technical institutes in the Soviet Union.

In 1963, together with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], I was a delegate to the Asian-American Assembly on Cultural Affairs and International Understanding at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

These and similar experiences which I know other Members of this House have had cannot fail to impress all of us with the increasing significance of education in international affairs.

Section 3 of the International Education Act of 1966 authorizes grants to colleges and universities for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies.

In addition to the centers for advanced international studies authorized by section 3, this legislation, in section 4, provides for grants to strengthen undergraduate programs in international studies. For example, such grants could be used to support faculty planning in undergraduate international studies, training faculty members in foreign countries, student work-study-travel programs, and programs of visiting foreign scholars.

Mr. Speaker, in May 1961, before assuming his present position, President Johnson succinctly expressed the cause he is urging that we serve in the International Education Act. He said: "Arms can never make us invulnerable nor our armies invincible, but the support we give to education can make freedom irresistible."

Mr. Speaker, I hope this measure will receive the full and careful consideration of this House and of the Senate and that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the text of the International Education Act of 1966:

U. S. 12452

A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "International Education Act of 1966".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research and to assist the progress of education in developing nations, in order to meet the requirements of world leadership.

CENTERS FOR ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to arrange through grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies. Activities carried on in such centers may be concentrated either on specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or issues in international affairs which concern one or more countries, or both.

(b) Grants under this section may be used to cover part or all of the cost of establishing, strengthening, equipping, and operating research and training centers, including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources and the cost of programs for bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center, for the training and improvement of the staff, and for the travel of the staff in foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the center may be concerned. Such grants may also include funds

for stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to individuals undergoing training in such centers, including allowances for dependents and for travel here and abroad. Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out its purposes.

GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Grants made under this section may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

- (1) faculty planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate programs in international studies;
- (2) training of faculty members in foreign countries;
- (3) expansion of foreign language courses;
- (4) work in the social sciences and humanities which is related to international studies;

(5) planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs; and

(6) programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit institutions as visiting faculty or resource persons.

(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Secretary shall not approve an application unless it—

(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities for which a grant is authorized under subsection (a);

(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(4) provides for making such report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(c) The Secretary shall allocate grants to institutions of higher education under this section in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States while at the same time giving a preference to those institutions which are most in need of additional funds for programs in international studies and which show real promise of being able to use additional funds effectively.

METHOD OF PAYMENT; FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 7. For the purpose of making grants under sections 3 and 4 of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

AMENDMENTS TO STRENGTHEN TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Removing requirement for area centers that adequate language instruction not be readily available

SEC. 8. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "(1)" and by striking out ", and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States".

(2) The first sentence of section 601(c) (as redesignated by section 102(a)) is amended by striking out "(with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a))" and inserting in lieu thereof "(with respect to which he makes the determination under subsection (a))".

Removing 50 per centum ceiling on Federal participation

(b) The third sentence of section 601(a) is amended by striking out "not more than 50 per centum" and inserting "all or part" in lieu thereof.

Authorizing grants as well as contracts for language and area centers

(c) Section 601(a) is amended by inserting "grants to or" after "arrange through" in the first sentence, and by inserting "grant or" before "contract" each time that it appears in the second and third sentences.

THE PRESIDENT'S INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROPOSALS PRAISED BY CHAIRMAN POWELL

(Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to warmly commend President Johnson for offering today one of the greatest contributions to international understanding in the history of this country.

The President's legislative proposals are a Magna Carta of international education which reaffirm man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof.

Not only do these recommendations significantly widen America's responsibilities and commitments to the free world, but they help to harness the intellectual resources of all nations in the global fight against ignorance and illiteracy.

That our country will join in this historic international educational partnership to exchange ideas, techniques, and materials is a happy reminder that knowledge knows no national boundaries.

The exciting diversity of the President's proposals all merit serious consideration. Together, all of these proposals will provide the needed stimulus to im-

A further thrust of the legislation in this area has been the recognition of the need for grant assistance for the smaller communities of the country—those having a population of less than 125,000. To meet this need, dollar limitations were imposed on the Federal grants and a portion of the appropriated funds was set aside for the smaller communities, where smaller project costs are involved. In these ways, the relatively limited annual appropriation is assured of being more equally distributed between large and small communities and projects.

The amendments I am proposing in legislation today are consistent with the spirit and intent of the prior legislation, while, I believe, offering the much-needed incentive formula for the States to meet their responsibilities.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, Public Law 89-234, amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and provides the following program of grant assistance for the construction of treatment works:

First, a grant is limited to 3 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of the project with a dollar limitation on the grant of \$1,200,000, for an individual project, and \$4,800,000, for a joint project in which two or more municipalities join.

Second, the dollar limitations imposed shall not apply in the case of grants made from appropriated funds in excess of \$100 million—the current authorization is \$150 million—if the State agrees to match equally all grants made from this allocation for projects in the State.

Third, in addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may increase the amount of a grant project certified by designated bodies as being in conformity with a comprehensive plan for the municipality.

My amendment would make the following changes:

First, if a community is eligible for a full 30 percent Federal grant without any State machinery, the Secretary may increase the amount of the Federal grant by up to an additional 30 percent, provided that the State match any additional amount, dollar for dollar.

Second, if there has been State matching of the initial 30 percent Federal grant, the Secretary may increase the amount of the Federal grant by up to an additional 15 percent, provided that the State also match the additional amount, dollar for dollar.

My amendment would increase the Federal share in the cost of construction of local community pollution control facilities, but only to the extent that the States themselves are willing to participate.

Under present law, a community must shoulder between 37 and 67 percent of the total cost of such projects, depending on which section of the act applies. My amendment would reduce these amounts to 4 and 5.5 percent, respectively, provided the States went along to the extent provided in the amendment.

Maximum Federal share under each phase would be increased from the present limits of 33 percent under both phases to 66 and 49.5 percent, respectively.

State participation would be required for an increased Federal share, of course.

Under the present law, no requirement exists for State participation under the provision covering small community projects, and only 30 percent for projects over the dollar limitation. My amendment would encourage a State share of up to 30 percent under the former provision and up to 45 percent under the latter.

I invite all of my colleagues to read and analyze the bills I introduce today. I feel they offer the most responsive and meaningful proposal so far for the kind of assistance and stimulation which will bring results where they are most needed, at the local community level.

I might point out in conclusion, that these bills are the result of a long and exhaustive study of the problem and of the solutions put forth to date. I welcome the opportunity to discuss them in more detail with the distinguished Members of this body.

It is my hope that they will be acted on as swiftly as possible in order to generate the necessary action in our States and communities.

PARTIAL PAYMENT OF "PRINCIPLE" TO THOSE WHO RISK THEIR LIVES IN OUR INTEREST

(Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this body has seen numerous bills over the years to partially repay, through educational benefits, our fighting men for the time lost to their careers by military service.

Today I am introducing a bill in support of that placed before this distinguished body on January 31 by my friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. TEAGUE].

The Congress has seen numerous bills over the years to partially repay, through educational benefits, our fighting men for the time lost to their careers by military service.

Some legislation has proposed that such benefits be limited to those who actually served in areas of special hazard. Others prescribed specific time periods for eligibility. There has been opposition to every proposal.

Now Congressman TEAGUE has introduced legislation that would go all the way back to where the Korean GI bill was arbitrarily cut off on January 31, 1955. This bill provides benefits that are surely not incommensurate with what our servicemen have done for us. This bill is the product of much thought and accommodation of divergent views. I believe it is a good bill, and I believe it is high time our Nation began meeting its responsibilities to those we ask to give up to and including their lives for our national purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as I have noted before in this House, we in Congress must meet our responsibilities to our returning veterans as earlier Congresses have done. The Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act is a

partial payment of principle to those who risk their lives in our interest.

THE PRESIDENT'S FATEFUL DECISION

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one man alone, the President of the United States, knows the deep agony and anguish that lay behind the fateful decision on Monday last to resume the bombing of Communist military targets in North Vietnam.

Yet all of us here, and I believe all Americans, know the significance of this decision for the future course of our Nation. The President has done what had to be done. He has done what had to be done because of the intransigence of the enemy we face. He has done what had to be done if we were to learn from the lessons of history.

Yesterday there appeared in New York's Journal American, and in all the Hearst newspapers across the country, an outstanding editorial which pointed out that we could not permit the enemy the privilege of a sanctuary from which to attack the defenders of freedom.

In pointed eloquence this editorial declared:

The wagers of aggressive war in North Vietnam must know that the wellsprings of their policies are as much a target as the streams they produce.

This is an editorial which expresses the sentiments I hold, and sentiments I feel are shared by many Members of this House. I ask permission for it to be inserted in the Record where all may read it:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Feb. 1, 1968]

The decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam was made to a very high degree in Hanoi and Peiping as in Washington. The leaders in both Communist capitals are aware that even the slightest response on their part to President Johnson's prodigious peace efforts since Christmas could have stayed the onslaught that now ranges the skies of North Vietnam.

But no such response was forthcoming, and indeed no sign was given that the premeditated aggression in South Vietnam had abated or would abate. The aggressors in short, threw down the challenging gauntlet to the United States sworn to defend South Vietnam's freedom, and this Nation had no option but to pick it up.

The acceptance of this challenge moreover is motivated by the intransigence of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung. It is motivated by history—when a similar decision was faced by the United States in the bitter and costlier Korean war. During that conflict there came a time when our enemies took full advantage of a sanctuary—north of the Yalu River—which we ourselves had proclaimed, to pursue their aggression and to peril great numbers of American troops.

Indeed it is now a fact of history that the Red Chinese Army command of that day admitted that it never would have advanced south into Korea had it not been certain that its bases in the north would remain immune from American attack. These bases did remain immune and the result is known to

history. The lesson is clear. There can be no sanctuary for aggressors. No one must be permitted to conduct such operations with impunity again. Thus the wagers of aggressive war in North Vietnam must know that the wellsprings of their policies are as much a target as the streams they produce.

But the way out is still open for those who have brought down such punishment on their heads. The Johnson administration, has for example, endorsed the proposal by Pope Paul VI for arbitration of the Vietnam problem by neutral nations. In addition, the United States has called for a full-scale United Nations Security Council debate on the matter. We seek, in short, to talk and parlay even as the bombers fly.

But it takes two to talk.

REPORT OF EXTENSIVE ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING THE DEVASTATION BROUGHT BY HURRICANE BETSY

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy to south Louisiana last September was tremendous, as every Member of this House knows. Death and destruction were left in its wake, but not for long.

The various agencies of the National Government, working with the State and parish governments, and coupled with the herculean determination and efforts of the people of Louisiana, restored the communities of south Louisiana more rapidly than anyone thought possible.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, directed by Col. Thomas J. Bowen, the corps' district engineer stationed in New Orleans, did a magnificent job above and beyond the call of duty to assist the people of New Orleans and the surrounding parishes in returning their communities to normal operations. The Army Engineers worked around the clock for days and days following the hurricane, which swept through southeast Louisiana on the night of September 9-10.

The Engineers surveyed damages; they evacuated hundreds of stranded, and temporarily homeless citizens; they provided emergency power in stricken areas; they pumped out the high waters in many areas; they contracted for the clearance of debris, and more than 223,800 truckloads of debris were cleared away under the direction of the corps; they surveyed all waterway channels to determine whether there were obstructions to passage; they restored those Federal levees under their purview, and helped to restore and strengthen those levees built by other governing bodies.

All in all, the Army Corps of Engineers performed many difficult tasks in an exemplary manner, and I am happy and proud to salute all the engineers and Colonel Bowen for their service to the people of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana.

Under the Federal Disaster Act, as amended, the Corps of Engineers are directed to survey damages; perform debris clearance; provide protective measures or other emergency assignments, and inspect completed disaster projects.

Following Hurricane Betsy, Mr. Speaker, the Army Engineers did all this, and much more, and I am pleased to commend them for a job well done. The Corps of Engineers has long served the people of the United States faithfully and well in peace and in war; and their employees, both military and civilian, are deserving of the highest tributes from their fellow citizens.

The New Orleans District of the Army Engineers has provided me with a full report of their extensive activities, before, during, and after Hurricane Betsy and I would like to commend this report to my fellow colleagues in the House and the Senate. The detailed report follows:

HURRICANE BETSY ACTIVITIES, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

In the early evening of August 26, 1965, a tropical depression was located in the South Atlantic Ocean 675 miles east northeast of Trinidad. By the following evening this depression had spawned a full blown hurricane destined to be remembered as "Betsy"—one of the most destructive storms of record.

With the inception of the hurricane the New Orleans District, with other gulf and Atlantic coast Districts of the Army's Corps of Engineers, began plotting the path of the storm from weather bureau advisories. Long established emergency operations plans and the availability of assigned corps personnel were verified. The period of watching and waiting for where and when had begun.

Members of the corps plotted Betsy's path as she moved westward, then northwestward, over the Windward and Leeward Islands, then north to the east of Puerto Rico, then again northwestward, aimed at the Virginia coastline and the city of Washington, D.C. Suddenly, during the night of August 30, while some 350 miles north of Puerto Rico, Betsy buttonhooked and headed south, then west, then northwest in the direction of the Carolinas. The populace of the gulf coast heaved a sigh of relief. The sigh was premature for, during the night of September 4 while some 325 miles east of Daytona Beach, Fla., Betsy again buttonhooked, headed south, then southwest, then west toward the southern tip of Florida. On September 7 Corps of Engineer personnel in the New Orleans District were alerted for possible emergency action. During the morning of September 8 the hurricane roared across the Florida Keys and into the Gulf of Mexico. Here she continued a generally westward course for approximately 24 hours and then on September 9 veered to the northwest and toward the Louisiana coastline.

On the morning of September 9, Col. Thomas J. Bowen, the corps district engineer in New Orleans, directed precautionary action throughout the threatened portions of his 47,000-square-mile district so as to protect Government installations, property and personnel. A preplanned emergency operations center was activated on a 24-hour basis in the New Orleans office. The unusually high forward speed of the hurricane and its erratic course limited the time available for prestorm activities to hours rather than days. Regardless, by Thursday night, September 9, all possible precautionary and protective measures had been taken and a continuous radio liaison with district installations established. The Corps of Engineers was ready.

In the early evening of September 9, the eye of Hurricane Betsy moved across the Louisiana coast just west of Grand Isle. Winds in excess of 160 m.p.h. were recorded. These winds, damaging enough by themselves, induced tidal surges up to 16 feet above mean sea level. These surges moved across the low-lying marshes to the east and north of the Mississippi River below New

Orleans and overtopped main line levees on both sides of the river in the lower parts of St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes. Back levees built by local agencies for reclamation and protection against tidal flooding were overtopped and breached in numerous places. Severe flooding occurred in portions of Orleans, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines Parishes. All in all, some 4,800 square miles were inundated. Transportation, communication, and utilities services were severely disrupted. The known dead count eventually reached 81 in number.

Fortunately, advance warning by the Weather Bureau had enabled thousands of people to flee their homes before the hurricane winds and waters struck. Many others were not so fortunate. Rapidly rising water trapped them in their homes, on roofs, on tops of cars, and anything else above the flood level. Evacuation by boat was their only salvation. Early on Friday, September 10, Corps of Engineer personnel and boats were ordered into the stricken area to join others in rescue operations. These were the first personnel from any Government agency to participate in this operation. By nightfall, over 1,200 persons had been rescued by the corps.

Also, early on the morning of September 10, Corps of Engineer employees of the New Orleans District, despite the fact that many of them had suffered severe damage themselves, came through water, wind, rain, fallen power lines and debris to report for work and emergency assignments. A preplanned disaster recovery center was activated and a well trained, highly capable, efficient organization of dedicated people swung into action. In anticipation of things to come, plans were initiated to send damage reconnaissance teams into the 35 Louisiana parishes laid waste by Betsy. Approximately 500 New Orleans District personnel were assigned to disaster work. Due to the extensiveness of the damaged area and the multiplicity of tasks that would have to be performed, this was not enough. A call for assistance from other corps installations throughout the country went out through corps channels. In a comparatively short period some 240 employees came pouring in—ready, willing and able to work. They came from Seattle and Baltimore, Vicksburg, Memphis and St. Louis, San Francisco and Jacksonville, Huntington and Los Angeles, Galveston and Kansas City and points in between. Every corps division in the continental United States responded well and rapidly.

In the evening of September 10, the President of the United States, with members of the Louisiana congressional delegation and officials of pertinent Federal agencies, flew into New Orleans to survey hurricane damages. The President promptly declared Louisiana a major natural disaster area and pledged all possible Federal assistance. The Office of Emergency Planning was directed to coordinate the relief and rehabilitation activities of all Federal agencies. As had been done on previous occasions, the Office of Emergency Planning assigned the major part of the rehabilitation work to the Corps of Engineers.

Already 35 Corps of Engineers assistance teams, each headed by a fully qualified engineer, had fanned out into Louisiana's damaged parishes. Their job was to survey damages and to determine the extent and type of rehabilitation work necessary, to advise local officials of Office of Emergency Planning's authority and procedures under Public Law 875, to supervise Corps of Engineers' emergency work in their respective areas, to give technical advice to local interests and to do all else necessary to render assistance and hasten a return to normalcy.

In the hours following the hurricane, the Corps of Engineers alerted the construction industry for mobilization of all possible

and technology and the information explosion—is one in which specialized knowledge is crucial to decisionmaking. Legislators responsible to the people must have that knowledge and be able to apply that knowledge for the benefit of the people.

The requirements for our profession have been upgraded through the years—in response to the new problems and new opportunities rising from those years. The arguments earlier advanced in favor of a 2- or 3-year term for Members of the House of Representatives have been strengthened with the passing of each and every year. The arguments have never been stronger than they are for a 4-year term today.

The lessons of our constitutional beginnings are relevant in a second respect.

At the Constitutional Convention, Hamilton shrewdly observed that "Frequency of elections tended to make the people listless to them." But today there are probably more elections occurring at more frequent intervals in the United States than in any nation on earth. The people do not insist on this great flood—many in fact find it wasteful, confusing, or irritating. A recent Gallup poll confirms that a substantial majority of Americans, regardless of political affiliation, favor changing the terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years. The people are already what we must become—sensible people. They want Members to spend less time campaigning for reelection, and more time concentrating upon the people's problems and meeting the people's needs.

We can start now. The time is now. The 2-year term for Members of the House is, in my opinion, an anachronism. It should be abolished for reasons the President and the people have given us—good, strong, sensible reasons that are even more compelling today than they were 175 years ago.

RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in all that has been written and said since the resumption of air strikes in North Vietnam, no explanation has been more logical or more compelling than the one advanced by the New York Journal American of February 1.

In a strong editorial, that paper put into words what we all know: "The decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam was made, to a very high degree, as much in Hanoi and Peiping as it was in Washington."

I submit that in the light of a complete lack of cooperative response from the other side, President Johnson could have made no other decision.

I also submit that the record is open for all to see, and I think the Journal American summed it up very well when it said:

The leaders in both Communist capitals are aware that even the slightest response on their part to President Johnson's prodigious peace efforts since Christmas could have stayed the mighty onslaught of power that now ranges the skies of North Vietnam.

The President made his difficult decision, as the editorial declared, because "no such response was forthcoming, and indeed no sign was given that the premeditated aggression in South Vietnam had abated or would abate. The aggressors, in short, threw down the challenging gauntlet to the United States, sworn to defend South Vietnam's freedom, and this Nation had no option but to pick it up."

This editorial adds substantially to what the world knows. I believe that my colleagues will want to study its logic and I therefore offer it for inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOMBERS TALK

The decision to resume the bombing of North Vietnam was made, to a very high degree, as much in Hanoi and Peiping as it was in Washington. The leaders in both Communist capitals are aware that even the slightest response on their part to President Johnson's prodigious peace efforts since Christmas could have stayed the mighty onslaught of power that now ranges the skies of North Vietnam.

But no such response was forthcoming, and indeed no sign was given that the premeditated aggression in South Vietnam had abated or would abate. The aggressors, in short, threw down the challenging gauntlet to the United States, sworn to defend South Vietnam's freedom and this Nation had no option but to pick it up.

The acceptance of this challenge, moreover, is motivated by more than the intransigence of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung. It is motivated by history, when a similar decision was faced by the United States in the bitter and much more costly Korean war. During that conflict there came a time when our enemies took full advantage of a sanctuary—north of the Yalu River—which we ourselves had proclaimed, to pursue their aggressions and to peril great numbers of American troops.

Indeed it is now a fact of history that the Chinese Red Army command of that day later admitted that it would never have advanced south into Korea if it had not been certain that its bases in the north would remain immune from American attack. These bases did remain immune, and the result is known to history.

NO SANCTUARY FOR AGGRESSORS

The lesson is clear. There can be no sanctuary for aggressors. No one must be permitted to conduct such operations with such impunity again. Thus the wagers of aggressive war in North Vietnam must know that the well-springs of their policies are as much a target as the streams they produce.

But the way out is still open for those who have brought down such punishment on their heads. The Johnson administration has, for example, endorsed the proposal by Pope Paul VI for arbitration of the Vietnam problem by neutral nations. In addition, the United States has called for a full-scale United Nations Security Council debate on the matter. We seek, in short, to talk and parlay even as the bombers fly.

But it takes two to talk.

SENATOR RIBICOFF ADDRESSES UNITED JEWISH APPEAL IN DALLAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the people of Dallas were pleased and privileged to play host recently to the

distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. The able Senator Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addressed the opening session of the United Jewish Appeal South-Southwestern regional conference at Dallas on January 22, 1966, and gave an informed and inspiring talk on the outstanding efforts of the U.S. Jewish community in supporting philanthropic activities. I am pleased that our distinguished colleague visited and spoke in my home State.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of Senator Ribicoff's talk appearing in the January 23, 1963, Dallas Morning News, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIBICOFF PRAISES EFFORTS OF JEWS

U.S. Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF praised supporters of the United Jewish Appeal here Saturday night for keeping faith with two great traditions—"the age-old Jewish tradition of caring for the needy and the American tradition of voluntary philanthropy."

The Connecticut Democrat, addressing the opening session of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) South-Southwest regional conference in the Statler Hilton Hotel, lauded local UJA organization workers for recognizing "the duty to allocate funds to support Jewish cultural and welfare needs on a national and international level.

"They accept the voluntary duty of sharing the fruits of well-being and freedom they have found in this blessed land with their uprooted and destitute brethren in all parts of the world.

"And I am proud to say that the same people who participate with time, effort, and money in aiding Jewish philanthropies, give in equal measure to the philanthropies of the community at large."

In this vein, he cited Max Fisher, UJA general chairman and president of the Detroit, Mich., United Fund.

Ribicoff also applauded the sense of responsibility taken on by UJA supporters.

"They do not shrug their shoulders at the plight of the less fortunate and say, 'Let the government take care of the situation.' They accept a personal responsibility to help care for those who need assistance.

"And in every town and city throughout our country, the local Jewish community doesn't wait for some governmental bureau to take care of the sick, the aged, the orphaned, or the distressed people among them. It organizes its own systems of aid to meet these problems.

"And it is supported by most of the members of the community on a voluntary basis—the basis of individual conscience and individual acceptance of that sacred duty to be his brother's keeper which is embodied in Judaism."

More than 500 community leaders from 10 States are attending the Dallas conference which will make plans for mobilizing support in the South and Southwest for the UJA's 1966 nationwide drive to raise \$73,420,000. The funds will go to Jewish immigrants in Israel and 30 other countries.

Speaking with Ribicoff at the first session Saturday night was UJA General Chairman Fisher who cited the group's major tasks in 1966 as:

Moving 55,000 Jewish immigrants and refugees from distressed areas of Europe, North Africa, and Asia to Israel "and other lands of freedom."

Make up the loss of \$17,500,000 as the result of the end of German reparations for

aid and rehabilitation programs on behalf of the surviving victims of Nazi persecution.

Speed absorption of 382,000 immigrants already in Israel.

And provide increased aid for more than 400,000 indigent Jews in various Moslem countries and Europe.

Principal speaker for the conference's closing session Sunday noon will be Michael Comay, Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations. Also speaking Sunday will be Mrs. Jack Karp of Los Angeles, Calif., UJA chairman.

STOP MURDER BY MOTOR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today in New York City the American Trial Lawyers Association, of which I am proud to be a longstanding member, is launching a broad-scale national attack on what it has truthfully named, in the title of a brochure already widely distributed throughout the Nation, "Murder by Motor."

Members of the American Trial Lawyers Association, as its president, Joseph Kelner, says in his introduction to the white paper or monograph, have "a vast storehouse of knowledge and experience acquired in investigation, preparation and trial of injury and death cases in the courts of our land." In issue after issue of the bimonthly publication, *Trial*, the association has expressed concern for the problems of traffic safety. Recent issues have followed the hearings which I chaired in the Commerce Committee on the tire safety bill by Senator NELSON, of which I was a cosponsor. They have reported on the hearings by Senator RUBINOFF, which were resumed this week, in the Government Operations Subcommittee. The organization, and its 20,000 members, has a longstanding interest in auto safety.

The 16 pages of "Murder by Motor" discusses, among other things, what it terms "the inadequate Government role."

It is an undeniable fact that the Federal Government has no comprehensive plan in existence or in contemplation to cope with this frightful problem which constitutes a major economic threat to our national economy and an ever-present hazard to the life and limb of our people.

I am most hopeful that we shall shortly be able to remedy that deplorable situation. I hope we may do it through the bill which I intend to introduce in the Senate tomorrow, and which Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY intends to introduce in the House on the same day. It is not my intention to discuss this bill in detail today, but it will be titled the National Traffic Safety Act, and it will provide a National Traffic Safety Agency with a center to include accident, engineering, and traffic studies of various kinds as a new national resource for an operating center to spearhead the attack on murder by motor. It will aim at the promotion of uniformity among the various States in a variety of traffic matters among which there is a sad lack of uniformity today, and one which contributes to our problems. It will empower the specification of safety standards and certification of vehicles for roadworthiness, in a manner

similar to that by which the Federal Aviation Agency certifies the airworthiness of planes before they become a regular part of our air traffic. In short, it will be a new and important center for study, for coordination, for Federal focus in the fight which we all must join, the crusade against public apathy toward traffic fatalities.

Throughout the Trial Lawyers' brochure there is discussion of the four main elements which contribute to highway accidents. These four are first, the driver; second, the automobile; third, the highway; and fourth the pedestrian. A panel of 2,000 lawyers from all 50 States has been set up to broadcast and lecture on these questions, which the association believes will be "one of the most ambitious and, hopefully, effective programs designed to focus public attention upon this monstrous problem."

But the "Stop Murder by Motor" campaign being launched today has more than an incidental tie to the Mackay-Hartke bill. The white paper not only presents the alarming and challenging facts of our highway carnage. Some of them are most striking, such as that while our military battle deaths from 1775 through 1964 totaled 605,000, our motor vehicle deaths from 1900 through 1964 came to 1,510,000. But it also presents a number of specific recommendations.

Among these are recommendations for Federal and State laws to require tire safety standards and uniform labeling to dispel the confusion we have seen in the testimony on the Nelson bill. There is also this specific recommendation on page 15:

Congress should enact a National Highway Safety Act providing for a National Director of Highway Safety with authority, personnel, and funds to act effectively.

As one who has long had a deep interest in auto safety and as the sponsor both of several bills now pending and of the Mackay-Hartke bill to be introduced tomorrow, it is a double pleasure to note the efforts of the American Trial Lawyers Association, which are being launched today in its national campaign. It is a double pleasure because I am myself a member of the organization, the only member of the Senate who is on the rolls of the Washington chapter. I hope its campaign will awaken the public conscience and jolt the public lethargy which has so much handicapped our efforts. I hope it will help to pave the way for not only acceptance of but demand for a national attack on the problem such as the Mackay-Hartke bill will provide.

Mr. President, the Washington Post of yesterday took editorial note of the trial lawyers' efforts, at the same time noting Congressman MACKAY's announced intention. I might add that although the Congressman's careful and prolonged work had already resulted in a preliminary draft before our collaboration, the bill which we shall introduce is the result of active cooperation between Mr. MACKAY and myself and between our staffs. I hope that when it is introduced there will be not only cosponsors in the House who are already prepared to join

Mr. MACKAY, but others who will wish to join me in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point the editorial of the Washington Post "Question of Survival," may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask that an editorial entitled "Highway Death Probe Needed," which appeared in the Franklin, Ind., Evening Star recently, may also appear. Finally, as a further contribution of significance to discussion of the traffic safety problem in general and to the background for the Hartke-Mackay bill, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "Stop Murder by Motor," single copies of which may be secured in its original format from the American Trial Lawyers Association, 6 Beacon Street, Boston, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post Feb. 1, 1966]

QUESTION OF SURVIVAL

President Johnson's call for national highway safety legislation in the present session of Congress is being widely echoed. Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY is about to introduce a bill that would set up a National Traffic Safety Agency with broad powers of research and testing and a mandate to seek "a more uniform traffic environment." The American Trial Lawyers' Association is sponsoring a more sweeping Federal effort in the safety field. It would have Congress provide minimum standards for automotive design and seek uniformity in the licensing of drivers.

The magnitude of the problem is illustrated by the trial lawyers' estimate that the human slaughter resulting from motor accidents will reach a total of 100,000 a year by 1975 if nothing is done to arrest the present trends. It was nearly half that figure last year. In addition, some 3 million persons were injured and \$8 billion worth of property was destroyed. It is truly a shocking price to pay for our mobility—a price that could at least be greatly reduced by safety devices, rational driving habits and a banishment of alcohol from the highways.

A report issued by the trial lawyers' estimates that shoulder harnesses, automobile doors that will not open in a crash and collapsible steering posts can virtually eliminate fatalities in accidents occurring at less than 35 miles an hour. And this, the report asserts, would include 87 percent of all motor accidents. We surmise that this optimism is overdrawn, but it is clear that much can be done by making cars safer, by requiring periodic examinations of both cars and drivers, by greater use of driver schools and the construction of better highways.

We think the time has come for Congress to take a hand in this campaign against slaughter on the highways. If construction standards are to be prescribed, they must necessarily be nationwide. Much could also be done to make driver requirements and rules of the road uniform. The close relationship of these remedial measures to human survival should give the proposed legislation a high priority.

[From the Franklin (Ind.) Evening Star]
HIGHWAY DEATH PROBE NEEDED

By any test of sanity, the top priority items on the agenda of the reconvening Congress, after national defense, should be an investigation into the carnage on our highways.

This is, in fact, a matter of national defense against an internal enemy which—

Killed more Americans (1,780) in the 10-day span that included Christmas and New

BATTLES RANGE WIDELY

Most important public issues are fought not only at the polls, but in parliamentary chambers, in cloak rooms, lobbies, executive offices, forums, newspapers, radio and TV, your mailbox and your living room.

Still in what other field of endeavor can one human being accomplish more for his generation and generations unborn?

What higher privilege can an individual receive than to be entrusted by thousands, millions, tens of millions of voters—with the future of this Republic, indeed, of this planet?

This generation, Arnold Toynbee has said, will be remembered as the first to dare to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

In administrative posts, too—in local, State, and National Government—you can help carry out an immense range of policies and programs. Whether it is implementing atoms for peace or the ZIP code for post office efficiency, you can help meet the needs of 195 million Americans and still greater numbers in the America of tomorrow.

A lifetime career in civil service has the full benefits of the merit system of recruitment, advancement, and protection.

Youth—and youthful idealism—are playing a more important role in these times than ever before. In the Peace Corps, in VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) the volunteer generation is making its mark for mankind.

Interested in public service? Great. Give it a real try.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR A WORLDWIDE PROGRAM OF MALARIA ERADICATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I welcome the President's proposal for a worldwide program of malaria eradication. Today we know what needs to be done to wipe out every vestige of this disease. We can wipe out the hiding places of the carrier mosquito; we can destroy the potential of its growth; and we can prevent the parasite from ever being transmitted again. We have the tools and the chemicals and the knowledge.

Malaria is the cause of great suffering in a large part of the world. It poisons the body, bringing sickness and death, and it saps initiative and energy.

I urge passage of the International Health Act. More can be accomplished by the eradication of malaria than by the building of great hospitals. More lives can be saved, more progress can be made, and more friends can be made for this Nation.

Having the power to control this dread disease, we should delay no longer in using it around the globe.

RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the President's decision to send our bombers back over North Vietnam, the Washington Evening Star doubtlessly summed up the conclusions of literally millions of Americans when it said:

As President and as Commander in Chief, conscious of his responsibility to some 200,000 American troops as well as the soldiers of our allies, who are under attack by a relentless foe, he could not have done otherwise.

Studied from any angle and from any quarter, the Star's editorial makes sound sense.

The American people should not be sold short if and when attempts are made to assess their "reaction." The people of this country have the facts. They know what has been done by this administration to seek any signs that would lead to the conference table. They also know the outcome of that search, for the outcome has been made crystal clear.

The people across the length and breadth of this land know the whys and wherefores of the President's decision, and the Star's editorial, to which I referred earlier, makes their case when it said, and I quote:

During the bombing pause, which lasted for 37 days, the Communists not only pressed ahead with the fighting; they also used the opportunity to redeploy their soldiers, bring up supplies, and repair the damage done to their transportation system. To have permitted this to go on indefinitely, as some urged, could only have resulted in heavier American and allied casualties. To his credit, his critics notwithstanding, the President was unwilling to pay this price. As he put it, it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit the casualty rolls which, in any event, will be long.

I suggest that my colleagues will want to study and restudy this editorial. It brings into proper perspective what needs to be said and what is being said all around this country.

To this end, I ask permission for it to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS CLEAR DUTY

In deciding to order a resumption of bombing of military targets in North Vietnam, Mr. Johnson did what had to be done. As President and as Commander in Chief, conscious of his responsibility to some 200,000 American troops as well as the soldiers of our allies, who are under attack by a relentless foe, he could not have done otherwise.

Obviously, it was not an easy decision to make. And the President, even while giving the order for the bombers to take off, renewed his pledge that the search for a just settlement will go on. One aspect of the quest is the arbitration proposal which Ambassador Goldberg has put before the U.N. Security Council. There is no occasion, however, for soaring hopes on this score. During the bombing pause, which lasted for 37 days, the Communists not only pressed ahead with the fighting; they also used the opportunity to redeploy their soldiers, bring up supplies, and repair the damage done to their transportation system. To have permitted this to go on indefinitely, as some urged, could only have resulted in heavier American and allied casualties. To his credit, his critics notwithstanding, the President was unwilling to pay this price. As he put it, it is our "clear duty" to do what we can to limit the casualty rolls which, in any event, will be long.

What is to be said of the critics, especially those in the Senate?

In 1776 Thomas Paine wrote that "these are the times that try men's souls." He also paid his respects to "the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot" who, in the crisis of that day, shrank from the demands of the war for freedom. If Paine were living now he might have something to say about sunshine Senators.

It is not our purpose to be invidious in suggesting this. But last week's spectacle in the Senate was nothing less than astonishing.

In the course of a 4-hour grilling of Secretary of State Rusk, one Senator after another came forward to wring his hands. Senator FULBRIGHT couldn't recall any issue about which there is so much "apprehension." Pennsylvania's Senator CLARK was "scared to death" that we are on the way to world war III. Senator MUNDR offered the profound observation that there is a "developing uncertainty" among the American people "about what this is all about." (Little wonder, if the people have been listening to the senatorial critics.)

One theme which runs through the criticism is that Congress, when it approved in 1964 a joint resolution supporting the President's policies, did not quite realize what it was all about, didn't quite intend to authorize the President to do precisely what he now is doing. Yet the language of the resolution is unambiguous. It puts Congress squarely on record as authorizing the President, as he may determine, "to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force," to assist South Vietnam in defense of its freedom. Pretty hard to wriggle out of an endorsement like that.

Senator MORSE was one of two Members of Congress who voted against the resolution. So he at least is entitled to be heard as he protests now. The Oregon Senator has been intemperate, even savage, in his criticism of the President. But he is also the only one to come forward with a proposal which goes beyond mere handwringing. The 1964 resolution provides that Congress may terminate it by another joint resolution, and Senator MORSE urges that this be done.

Perhaps this should be brought to a test. Let us find out how many Members of Congress, in the face of Ho Chi Minh's adamant refusal to discuss peace except on his own terms, would vote to rescind the authority previously given the President. Let us find out what those who might vote for revocation propose to do about the war, about the 200,000 American troops who are fighting the battle, and whether they intend to waltz on our Nation's commitment to a free choice for South Vietnam.

Our guess is that such a resolution could not muster a corporal's guard in Congress. If this is so, there should be an end to aimless speeches and protests which serve no better purpose than to undermine the President and to encourage the enemy.

EDUCATION POLICY FOR A NONCONFORMIST AGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we must be ever vigilant to new concepts of education which compliment our surging economy and our swift moving technological progress.

Such a new concept I would call the Senate's attention today which is being proposed by a Kansas education advisory committee.

Mr. John H. Colburn, editor and publisher of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle and Beacon, recently addressed himself to the needed changes in education in a speech he presented to the Kansas State School Board's Association at Topeka, Kans., on January 18, 1966. Mr. Colburn's statements, I believe, are prophetic and I would urge all interested in orderly progress of education to read this speech by Mr. Colburn.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Colburn's address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION POLICY FOR A NONCONFORMIST AGE
(By John H. Colburn)

Nonconformism has many facets. In discussing "Education Policy in a Nonconformist Age," I view nonconformism in the framework of new ideas, of new concepts, of innovation, creativity. You see many examples in our space program, our scientific and medical progress, the automation that started on the farm and has spread to business and industry.

You hear more about a different type of beatnik nonconformism. Young men wearing bobbed hair to their shoulders, jean-clad young women marching with bearded ones who burn their draft cards, girls in wading boots, their hair knotted in rope, who dance as if possessed of a terrible itch—cubes so far out as to be positively lunar, as the cool teens would describe it.

Nonconformity can be dangerous. It can be silly, and it can be challenging and exciting. Dangerous because new ideas imperil the status quo and always appear frightening to some people, silly because of what people will do to attract attention and seek status, challenging because of the tremendous stimulus new ideas can provide those exploring the frontiers of change.

Today the twin revolutions of technology and communications have swept away all certainty about the landscape of tomorrow. We cannot educate for the unpredictable tomorrows. But education can—and must—train pupils to be creative, imaginative in their thinking, and to encourage them to be constructive, thought-provoking nonconformists embracing new modes of thought and action. Uniformity of thought and complacent performance are trademarks of a society that fears the unknowns, one that has always resisted new ideas. These are the types of groups who regarded the greatest teacher of them all—Jesus Christ—as a radical and subversive because his ideas were new—nonconformist and consequently dangerous.

Now is the time to implement radical, new approaches to education. And the impetus for change must come from far-sighted leaders in education, in business, in the professions and from politicians dedicated to better serving the public welfare. The impetus is not likely to be forced on the schools from people satisfied with the present system because they know no criteria for a better system. They fail to realize that better systems attract better people and lead to more prosperous communities.

A society that is promised relief from everything from tired blood to tired floors needs relief from the everybody sameness, the look-alikes, think-alikes, act-alikes. If you want to explore the horizons of the future, don't be the first on your block to hop on the bandwagon of conformity. Get off the bandwagon. Better still, move off the block and reignite the spirit of individual freedom that existed a century ago when the Leavenworth Times headlined this story: "Great Express Enterprise—From Leavenworth to Sacramento in 10 Days—Clear the Path and Let the Pony Come Through."

In those days, man governed his speed by how fast he could motivate his horse to run. The locomotive cracked the oats barrier to progress and in 1910 the early airplane hit the fantastic speed of 42 miles an hour. Contrast this with astronauts circling the earth in 90 minutes, walking through space at 17,000 miles an hour, jockeying two rocket ships to a cozy rendezvous 180 miles above the earth.

These are products of our nonconformist technological and communications revolutions—spacemen conversing with earthlings,

man-controlled satellites transmitting images through computer signals picturing a barren lunar surface man may be exploring within 5 years.

These are harbingers of dramatic new methods of transportation. By the early eighties commercial travelers may be zooming from the United States to any point in the world by rocket ship in 45 minutes. The rocket ship will be 7 times faster than the supersonic transport, with takeoffs and descents at 3 times the pull of gravity providing the thrill of riding a gigantic roller coaster.

From pony express to rocket travel—all within the span of a century, which has witnessed marked sociological and behavioral as well as technological changes in every segment of society, the liberation of the common man, the search for the uncommon man who can cope with the forces of revolutionary change, and don't overlook the forgotten man, the victim of change.

There is nothing new about change. As long ago as 513 B.C., the Greek philosopher Heraclitus voiced the eternal truth, "there is nothing permanent except change." Our problem is that knowledge has been generated at such a rate that change is being produced faster than people and communities can absorb it.

And within the next 10 to 20 years we will witness change of a magnitude never known or dreamed of before. It will be a world so different from what we know that it will seem that we jumped a century into the future. Here are some of the highlights forecasters predict for you and your children:

By 1984 a system of sophisticated teaching machines that will provide more opportunities for fast learners and give teachers more time to devote personal attention to slow learners. Automated libraries and information retrieval systems will aid schools to take better advantage of the flood of new information.

There will be a permanent exploration base on the moon.

Personality control drugs will be used widely—and generally accepted—although some scientists fear the effects on society may have repercussions comparable to the soul-searching that has followed development of nuclear power.

Genetic scientists may be able to control the personality and sex of a child—a sociological power that few people today have the wisdom to utilize intelligently.

Then by the year 2000, only 34 years from now, new mineral raw material—and new foods—will come from colonies and farms established in the ocean depths.

Permanent, unmanned research stations will have been established after man's landing on Mars.

Weather manipulation will be possible.

And by the year 2100, or before, completely automated highway transportation will end the carnage resulting from human irresponsibility on our roads.

Chemical techniques will control our aging process.

Man-machine symbiosis, whereby a person can raise his intelligence through a tie-in of his brain with a computer, will be in wide use.

Experiments with personality control drugs to try to predict and influence the behavior of individuals are now underway, and military researchers are trying to determine the practicality of mindreading. Some comment that "most minds aren't worth reading" and this may well be because the average person utilizes only about 2 to 5 percent of his potential brainpower.

To get some idea of how these changes relate to the past, what was life like 40 years ago?

Sixty-four nations divided a world of 2 billion humans. Now the world's population is up to 3,218,000 plus and probably

increased 5,000 or so since I was introduced. Instead of 64 nations we have 115—established, emerging, peaceful, quarreling, submerging, big, little, viable, stillborn, coherent, incoherent—and some comic opera operations.

A quarter of a century ago we flew at 100-plus miles an hour and Lindbergh hadn't yet flown the Atlantic—let alone any more dreaming our jet set could breakfast in Paris and have a second breakfast cup of coffee in New York the same morning. Few here would want to return to those days * * * and your grandchildren 50 years from now—in 2016—will they be content with the times of 1966?

Hardly. That is why, in our educational outlook, we must penetrate the minds of future ages. If our goal is to enable man to realize his maximum potential, obsolete, inefficient educational procedures must be scrapped and a new program and philosophy implemented.

No young man or woman should be allowed to leave our educational system without being prepared to do something useful in society. Man must be taught how to be more than the soulless adjunct to a machine, to learn more about the great social, moral, and psychological issues. Otherwise he will become the victim of an era of cybernation where factual situations fed into electronic brains will drive out our culture in the same way that cheap money drives out sound money—a victim of greater conformity.

We can't waste human resources through lack of proper education, as we are doing today. We must see that a substantially smaller number of workers are in the unskilled and semiskilled categories; that a much larger number are in the highly skilled vocational and highly educated professional classes.

Thus you can see from this outline, the necessity of making the proposed educational amendment to the Kansas constitution a document tailored to the future, as well as the present. It must be a document basic enough to endure but flexible enough to cope with the future magnitude of change through statutory provisions.

Obviously outdated is the present section providing for a uniform system of common schools and schools of higher grade, embracing normal, preparatory, collegiate, and university departments, as it is described in the present constitution. We no longer have normal and preparatory schools. Collegiate departments have disappeared. Junior high schools, high schools, vocational schools, technical institutes, community junior colleges, and extensive university systems are now a part of our educational structure.

The proposed amendment recognizes these changes. For the first time, it gives local-elected school boards constitutional status, making them responsible for the operation of local public schools. A State board of education and a State board of regents also are guaranteed the people, providing constitutional protection against the growing encroachment of the National Government.

Another paramount change would make vocational education an integral part of the educational system. For nearly 40 years the State has administered academic and vocational programs from separate offices—one of three such States to have such an obsolete system. The other 47 States have found—as our committee found—that a combined administration is essential for student welfare and for sound, efficient administration.

Regardless of what happens to the proposed amendment, the scope of vocational education and its administration must be improved. Our committee met this afternoon to give this subject No. 1 priority in phase II of our study for the legislative council.

February 2, 1966

was the domain of the fierce Mescalero Apaches and was crossed also by the great war trail of the Comanches.

In the autumn of 1854 the Army established a stronghold in the heart of Apache country, a short distance west of the Comanche war trail. The site was 475 miles northwest of San Antonio, 220 miles southeast of El Paso by wagon road. They manned the outpost with six companies of infantrymen and named it Fort Davis, in honor of Secretary of War Jefferson Davis, who had authorized its establishment. In a box canyon, near Limpia Creek, the soldiers built 60 crude structures of log and lumber, cutting pine from the surrounding Davis Mountains and sawing it at their own mill.

From this isolated post they supplied escorts for mail and passenger coaches, rescued wagon trains attacked by the Indians and on occasion mounted mules to follow raiding Apaches through the mountains on punitive expeditions. From time to time cavalry troops sent out from the lower country used Fort Davis as headquarters for war against the tribes. Slowly the Army drove the Mescaleros into Mexico and forced the Comanches to use other routes.

From 1857 to 1860 Fort Davis was one of the centers for testing War Secretary Davis' idea of using camels for military purposes in the desert regions of the West. Late in June of 1859 two dozen camels, under the personal supervision of a picturesque character named Hadji Ali, were at the fort for several days. They were on a "test run" from San Antonio into the Big Bend. Soldiers and settlers gathered around to view the strange awkward animals and their stranger guardian, whom they promptly dubbed "Hi-Jolly." The swarthy little fellow, with his red fez and rainbow-hued pantaloons, seemed as out of place in far west Texas as his charges.

The camels performed well, traveling in apparent comfort up to 4 days without drinking and proving immune to the bite of the deadly rattlesnake. They ran into trouble in the Big Bend, however, where the thorny ground cover and sharp rocks damaged their tender feet. An answer to this problem might have been found if the approach of the Civil War had not removed Jeff Davis and his projects from Federal favor.

During the war the fort was briefly occupied by Confederates, then abandoned to the tender mercies of the Indians and elements. Between them, these destructive forces wiped out the place. In 1867, when Federal troops returned, they built a new fort, of rock and adobe, in the present location.

Fort Davis became a major installation, with quarters for 10 troops of cavalry and 2 companies of infantry. Many of the enlisted men were Negro, or "buffalo soldiers," as the Indians called them. They waged a persistent bitter war against the Indians throughout the Davis Mountains and the rugged Chisos of the Big Bend. When the Comanches were beaten by other troops under Randal McKenzie, at the Palo Duro, in 1875, one of the threats to the travelers was removed.

The Mescalero Apaches fought on for another 5 years, retreating into the mountain vastness of Mexico when hard pressed, but returning from time to time on desperate bloody raids. Finally, in 1880, the tribes under daring Chief Victorio were soundly defeated and driven across the Rio Grande for the last time. In the next 10 years Fort Davis duty was easier. There were occasional Indian raids from across the river and more frequent forays by Mexican bandits, but nothing to test the mettle of field-hardened fighters. In June of 1881 the country was declared safe and the fort was abandoned.

This large military installation stood empty and desolate for years, slowly disintegrating. The land on which the fort stood

had always been private property, only leased by the Government. For years the better of the officers' quarters were rented by landowners to citizens of the town which had grown up beside the fort and taken its name. Later the houses were regularly rented to summer visitors from Houston, Galveston, and Austin, who came to enjoy the comfort of the "air-conditioned" summers. In the late 1920's an Oklahoma oilman leased the fort and restored a few buildings, using it as the setting for a series of "horse operas" featuring the movie star, Jack Hoxie. The depression put an end to that.

Fort Davis citizens made a valiant effort to raise money to buy the site and save the old fort in the early 1940's, but World War II intervened. The great genuine relic of our frontier Indian wars and migrations westward seemed doomed to oblivion until 1963, when it was named a national historic site and put under the care of the National Park Service.

Today many of the original buildings have been restored, the site has been cleaned up and plans have been made for further restoration. The rocky wagon trails of the past have been replaced by hard-surfaced highways and tourists from all over the country come to enjoy a peep into the past.

IS THERE ANYTHING TO NEGOTIATE?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the peace offensive which we have been conducting raises the question in everyone's mind about what we hope to accomplish through negotiations and what kind of settlement could possibly emerge. These are difficult questions, and we must ponder them carefully.

In this connection, I wish to commend to my colleagues a recent essay in Time magazine entitled "Is There Anything To Negotiate?"

This essay begins by quoting a statement Jonathan Swift wrote in a different time and place, but which is relevant to our situation today. He wrote this of negotiations:

Supposing the war to have commenced upon a just motive; the next thing to be considered is when a prince ought in prudence to receive the overtures of a peace: which I take to be, either when the enemy is ready to yield the point originally contended for, or when that point is found impossible to be ever obtained.

Time points out that the United States is not yielding the point for which it is contending; namely the independence, freedom, and self-determination of the people of Vietnam, and has certainly not concluded that this goal is impossible to attain. Likewise, the enemy does not appear ready to yield his point, that the United States must be driven out of Vietnam, and thus far does not seem persuaded that this goal is unattainable.

Under such circumstances—

The essay states—

it is highly questionable just what negotiations could accomplish. * * * In fact, it is hard to see what the United States and the Communists could find to negotiate about at the present time with any expectation of results.

These troubled times must be considered in the light of our history and the principles for which we stand. Compromise with aggression has never brought forth an end to aggression before, and

there is no reason to suspect that it would do so today.

I request unanimous consent to insert this thoughtful and most timely essay in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE REALLY ANYTHING TO NEGOTIATE?

"Supposing the war to have commenced upon a just motive; the next thing to be considered is when a prince ought in prudence to receive the overtures of a peace: Which I take to be, either when the enemy is ready to yield the point originally contended for, or when that point is found impossible to be ever obtained."

That is how Jonathan Swift defined the necessary conditions for ending a war. There is no sign that these conditions have been reached in Vietnam. The United States is certainly not yielding the point it is contending for—the independence of South Vietnam—and has certainly not concluded that this goal is impossible to attain. Conversely, the enemy does not appear ready to yield his point either—that the United States must be driven out of Vietnam—and, as far as anyone can tell so far, has not been persuaded that this goal is unattainable.

Under the circumstances, it is highly questionable just what negotiations could accomplish. Amid the current U.S. peace overtures, there is a widespread, hopeful feeling that if only both sides start talking, peace will follow. In fact, it is hard to see what, if anything, the United States and the Communists could find to negotiate about at the present time with any expectation of results.

Hanoi has spelled out its aims in four points, and they add up to outright withdrawal of U.S. troops and the seizure of South Vietnam by the Vietcong. Washington counters with its own 14 points, which actually go a considerable way toward creating areas for negotiation—but which are easily misunderstood, unless the fine print and the implicit qualifications are kept in mind. The rockbottom, irreducible U.S. aim is that South Vietnam must be independent. Under every conceivable point of negotiation—provided both sides mean what they say—this U.S. minimum goal conflicts head-on with the Communist demand. Nevertheless, there is considerable interest in the principal topics that could come up at a bargaining table. They add up to six:

(1) When to stop fighting. Despite the U.S. proposal that "a cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference," high American officials in Saigon and Washington warn that the United States should do just the opposite, maintaining and perhaps increasing military pressure until discussions are successfully concluded. In his book, "How Communists Negotiate," Adm. C. Turner Joy (retired) the U.N.'s chief negotiator in Korea, charges that Washington's early agreement to a truce line at the Panmunjom peace talks in 1951, "was the turning point of the armistice conference. Thereafter, we lacked the essential military pressure to enforce a reasonable attitude"—and 70,000 American casualties were sustained under Communist attacks while the talks dragged on for 2 years. In Vietnam, warns a top U.S. diplomat in the Far East, to ease up on the battlefield would be "to insure a loss at the bargaining table." Furthermore, if talks broke down after a cease-fire, it would be difficult to regain the momentum to start the war up again. Some U.S. diplomats also insist that any talks should have a time limit and not be allowed to go on indefinitely, and that a system for supervision and inspection of whatever measures may eventually be agreed on should be nailed down first.

Question. Doesn't the Supreme Court decision deal only with reapportionment of State legislatures, not with the Federal Government?

Answer. But the Court has upset a balance between the Central Government and the States by intruding to tell a State what it must do with its legislature. In doing so, they have violated the whole principle of fair, balanced representation, which it has taken centuries to achieve, and that makes the situation a crisis in our governmental scheme. Let's spell it out a little to see how these things grow: Almost immediately after the Court's decision in June 1964, a suit was filed in Kent County, Mich., to reapportion the board of supervisors on the basis of one man, one vote.

A suit has even been filed by the dean of De Paul University in Chicago to force reapportionment of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois to carry out the edict of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Now, how far do you go? There's no end to what that rolling decision can finally do.

They talk about "rotten boroughs" and about a State senator who may represent 20 times as many constituents as another State senator. Look at the Senate of the United States. There are 2 Senators from New York State with a population of 17 million, and 2 Senators from Nevada with a population of 265,000. Just figure out the discrepancy in representation there.

PROTECTING STATES ROLE

Question. Those who favor the reapportionment decision say that you are opposing a shift that will bring government closer to a pure democracy—

Answer. Ours is a representative republic. I believe it is within the domain of a State to give representation and balance to the interests in that State.

Look at how control in many States will shift completely to urban areas. In Illinois, Cook County—which includes Chicago—has more than half the population of our State. That means that, if they so desire, representatives of one county can do pretty much as they please with respect to the other 101 counties.

What's involved in the other 101 counties? These are the areas where you have rural schools. You don't have rural schools in Chicago. What about farmland? Not much of that in Chicago. This one county controlling the situation may decide to put a State tax on farmland.

There's no end to what might be done. I made a list three pages long of the things that would be of importance. All those will be subject to an urban-controlled legislature under the one-man, one-vote principle.

Question. Do you think the result would be a dictatorship of the majority that could deny the minority its rights?

Answer. Yes. But there's another aspect in all this that is overlooked:

Those who are organized to resist my amendment and who want to perpetuate this one-man, one-vote ruling are smart. Mr. Meany (George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO) said he would rather give up on repeal of 14(b) forever than surrender on reapportionment. Why? Because labor leaders know that they can control both branches of many State legislatures under this Supreme Court decision. Lack of that control has been their problem.

In Illinois, for example, labor could get things through our general assembly, but when it came to the State senate there was a chance to take a look and cool things off.

Question. What does your amendment on reapportionment provide?

Answer. It would require one branch of a State legislature to be apportioned strictly on the basis of population. The other branch could be based on factors other than popu-

lation. The apportionment plan developed by the State legislature would be submitted to the voters in a referendum. On that referendum ballot, you would have to put on the one-man, one-vote plan, also. Now they say: "Well, it's too late. The boat has left the pier."

Question. Too late to reverse the Supreme Court action?

Answer. Not to reverse it, but to meet it. They say too many States have already reapportioned on the basis of one man, one vote.

They miss the point. Let us assume that we get this amendment passed and the States ratify it so that it becomes part of the Constitution. My State might not want to do anything about it. Tennessee might not want to do anything. The point is that I want to have available to the people of the States a weapon that they can use if they want to. Today, there is no weapon.

We want to go back to the people. They are the sovereign in our form of government. In my amendment, we have said that after every decennial census the State legislature must again submit an apportionment plan to the people. So once every 10 years, the people have a chance to vote on the matter.

Question. Do you look for the Democrats to push for an increase of the minimum wage in this new session?

Answer. Yes. They have talked about as much as \$2 an hour, and extended coverage. And, from my earlier excursion into that field, when I was on the Senate Labor Committee, I know that this would have great impact. It would involve a lot of small establishments—restaurants, laundries, groceries, notions stores, etc. Such an increase in the minimum wage, coupled with extensive new coverage, would be quite a burden. It would, as I see it, liquidate a great many little businesses that simply can't take it.

Question. Looking forward to the November elections: Would you be willing to estimate the extent of the Republican gains you expect?

Answer. No, because you still have 10 months to go. In 10 months, all sorts of things can happen. Who shall say, between now and November, what will take place with all the uncertainties in the world? All of a sudden, for example, we find ourselves with a finger in the pie over in Rhodesia.

Question. Should we have a finger in that pie?

Answer. Frankly, that's a long way from home, and, after all, what we're trying to do is to give some aid to Wilson (Harold Wilson, British Prime Minister). But, now, here are these African countries running out on Wilson. So what's going to be the upshot of this matter?

Here we have the Dominican Republic. That's as far from being peaceful as it was the day we sent the boys down there.

And who knows what the Cubans are going to do? Chile wants to put up the price of copper. Brazil has been converted into a virtual dictatorship. Who knows in what direction President de Gaulle is going to go? Or whether Chancellor Erhard was satisfied with his conversations here?

On top of everything there's the population increase—65 million more people in the world every year, with 15 million more in Red China alone. How will Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai feel when they get a billion people in 1980?

DECISIONS UNITED STATES MUST MAKE

Question. What moral do you draw from all this, Senator?

Answer. The moral is that we will be plagued with headaches, and at long last we are going to have to answer for ourselves.

Exactly what is our capacity to redress all

the ills, problems, and grievances of the world? At what point must we draw the line in our own interest and for the sake of our own security and our own solvency? To me, that line has to be drawn sometime in the not too distant future.

THE GHOSTS OF FALLEN APACHES AND TROOPERS HAUNT OLD FORT DAVIS, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Fort Davis, in the trans-Pecos section of west Texas, has been the scene of many memorable and colorful moments in the history of the Old West. Built in 1854 and named after Secretary of War Jefferson Davis, the fort was originally an important outpost for protection from the Mescalero Apaches and the Comanches. It later became the test site for Secretary Davis' proposal to use camels for military purposes in the desert. After having been abandoned during the Civil War, it was a major installation from 1867 until it was abandoned when the surrounding country finally became safe from Indian attack.

The fort stood empty and slowly disintegrated during the years that followed, until it was declared a national historic site in 1963. I was honored to be the Senate sponsor of the legislation that resulted in the preservation for the people of this remarkable part of our western heritage.

Last year scores of thousands of visitors came to Fort Davis to see for themselves this last outpost of the frontier.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by R. Henderson Shuffler, director of the Texana program of the University of Texas, and appearing in the Texas magazine of the January 23 Houston Chronicle, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CAMELS ONCE TREKKED HERE, TOO

From 1821 to 1846 Texas was the end of the rainbow for land-hungry frontiersmen. Then came the war with Mexico, ending with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. Suddenly the rainbow's end jumped half a continent west and old man Sutter found the pot of gold at its California tip.

In the mad scramble to the gold fields, the most obvious shortcut from the south lay through Texas. This route also avoided the bitter winters and raging rivers of the northern Rockies, in which many earlier travelers had died. But the southern route had its problems, too: a scarcity of water and a surplus of Indians.

The slow-moving wagons covered only 12 to 15 miles a day. If waterholes were more than 1 day's drive apart, men and stock were inconvenienced; when they were forced to dry-camp more than 2 nights in a row, they suffered. The Army surveyed a route from San Antonio to El Paso which promised survival for both man and beast. There were 42 waterholes on the trail, and only three of them were more than a 2-day drive apart.

Immigrant and freight wagon trains pushed over this trail, followed soon by stagecoaches carrying passengers and mail. Stage stands were established along the route, to supply fresh mules, food and some semblance of safety. But in the vast reaches of the trans-Pecos there was no safety. This

(2) Who participates? In suggesting negotiations a year and a half ago, Charles de Gaulle proposed that talks be carried on by the reconvened 1954 Geneva Conference, which was attended by France, the United States, Great Britain, Communist China, Russia, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Washington would go along with this, but there has been little indication that such a disparate group would even sit down together today. Moreover, the United States is concerned that a large conference might degenerate into a Communist-dominated mob scene that would attempt to stampede Washington into undue concessions. A more important issue is Hanoi's insistence that the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong, be seated as an equal participant. This the United States has rejected because it considers the front the pawn of North Vietnam, and feels that seating it would confer on the subversive organization that the United States has been fighting the status of a legitimate political power. However, Washington suggests that the Vietcong "would not have difficulty having their views represented" if the front attended as part of the North Vietnamese delegation. Says Secretary of State Rusk: "We don't care a bit who sits behind Hanoi's back at a conference table."

(3) The Vietcong's future. The question of the Vietcong's status at the conference table leads directly to the far larger question of the Vietcong's future status in the country. Hanoi flatly demands that "the internal affairs of South Vietnam be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front." The United States rejects this, arguing that it would in effect mean handing over South Vietnam to the Vietcong and hence to Hanoi. Some critics of U.S. policy disagree, asserting that the Liberation Front is, in large measure, a genuine nationalist movement and would sooner or later be independent of Hanoi. While the front certainly includes many non-Communists and nationalists, every reasonably well-informed source agrees that it is an integral part of Hanoi's Communist apparatus. Communists themselves like to compare the front to the Asian crane—"a big bird with a large white and a small red head." Since the Vietcong now hold at least two-thirds of South Vietnam's territory (though mostly the least populated areas), it is difficult to see how or why they should allow themselves to be excluded from any future political role. On the other hand, the United States minimal demand for an independent South Vietnam would be reduced to sham if the Vietcong were to have a leading role in a future coalition government, which they obviously would seek to subvert and dominate.

(4) Elections. The country's political future, says the United States, should be determined by free elections in South Vietnam. In genuinely free elections, Washington feels that the Vietcong would not do nearly so well as thought by some observers who underestimate the genuine anti-Communist sentiment in South Vietnam. However, free elections are obviously impossible while the Vietcong retain their arms and their whole apparatus of terror, and before a measure of security, stability, and free political life has been restored to the war-torn country. Much the same applies to Hanoi's demand for "the peaceful reunification" of North and South Vietnam. The United States concedes that this should be determined through free decision of both people, the key phrase being "free decision." The United States would want a genuine vote both in the South and in the North (which, of course, has never had a free vote under Communist rule). Hanoi would want a plebiscite engineered and dominated by the Communists.

(5) The presence of U.S. troops. Hanoi demands the withdrawal of U.S. troops and the

dismantling of U.S. military bases. Washington replies that "we want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia" and "do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam," but adds the essential qualification, "after peace is assured." In other words, the United States is perfectly willing to get out of South Vietnam, but only when and if the country is made really secure, which would obviously take a long time. As a Washington observer explains: "It is not U.S. policy to seek or maintain bases in southeast Asia merely for the purpose of having such bases. The bases will remain in the area only so long as they are essential for the protection of countries." Hanoi, of course, does not concede that Vietcong infiltration or subversion is a form of aggression from which South Vietnam requires protection. An international control commission or peace force to supervise and police a possible settlement has been suggested as a way out, but hardly any serious observers believe that this would work in the long run. The possibility is also being advanced that the United States for the time being hold on to the one-third or so of South Vietnam's territory that the Americans and the Saigon government currently control—the cities and coastal enclaves—and abandon the rest to the Vietcong until it could be liberated by a United States backed hidden war, in which United States and South Vietnamese troops would wage a quiet guerrilla campaign in reverse against the Communists. But this, too, would in effect temporarily hand the Vietcong control of most of the country.

(6) Neutralization. There have been various suggestions for a neutralized setup, not in Vietnam alone but in the whole area—a series of buffer states between Red China and the West. Laos, of course, is formally neutral already, and highly unstable, but currently leaning toward the West. Cambodia is also technically neutral, but leaning heavily toward China. For these countries, and perhaps Burma, a regional neutrality system might make sense from the Western point of view. Thailand, on the other hand, is the most stable country in the area, staunchly anti-Communist and pro-West, and its neutralization might well be unacceptable to its own people. On this, the U.S. position is that "the countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral; the United States wants no new allies." But it would have to be true neutrality, meaning genuine independence—and it is virtually impossible to see what military or political force could insure this.

Washington is not trying to push Ho Chi Minh into an agreement formally admitting defeat. After all, he has not yet been defeated. But for negotiations to yield any real results, the Communists would have to admit tacitly that they cannot force the United States out, and thus conclude that they might as well cut their losses under some face-saving formula. Should the Communists ever reach that point, it is entirely possible that it would not lead them to the conference table at all, but that the war would end in a military stalemate and the gradual petering out of guerrilla attacks—as they petered out without ceremony in Greece, the Philippines, Malaya, and the Congo.

THE FUTURE OF FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the recent announcement by the Federal Aviation Agency that they would begin permitting jet flights to utilize Washington National Airport has prompted a storm of protests from those who are concerned with the safety of the public in the air and on the ground; those concerned with the impact of jet landings

and takeoffs on Washington residents and visitors; and those concerned with the wasteful duplication of expenditure in the construction of Dulles International Airport and the subsequent opening of Washington National for jets.

Recent editorials from the News American and the Maryland Gazette point up the inconsistencies and blunders which have characterized public policy with respect to the operation of Washington National and Dulles Airports by the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Jan. 26, 1966]

THE FUTURE OF FRIENDSHIP

The most recent threat to the future prosperity of Friendship Airport has been chronicled in a series of articles, "The Airport Nightmare," by News American staffer Ray Abram, Jr.

Charles Crane, chairman of the Friendship Airport Board, calls the decision of the Federal Aviation Agency to allow small jets to use Washington's National Airport starting April 24 "another declaration of war."

Mr. Crane has made it clear that he intends to respond to this new challenge with the same vigor with which he met, and overcame, the threat to Friendship posed by that \$120 million Federal "white elephant," Dulles Airport at Chantilly, Va.

Friendship has a number of things going for it. It is a young airport, with plenty of room to expand. Its long runways are already capable of handling any known or conceivable jets. Its facilities are up to date, and, as the Abrams series points out, it is able to offer "creature comforts" undreamed of at the crowded Washington National Airport.

We have no doubt that Friendship, under Mr. Crane's capable guidance, will meet the challenge.

But the fact that it has been posed should instill new vigor into a legislative drive to divorce the regulatory functions of the Federal Aviation Agency from its role as an airport manager. A Federal agency has no business wearing both hats. The sooner this unfortunate state of affairs is ended, the better.

[From the Maryland Gazette, Jan. 20, 1966]

AIRPORT FACES NEW FIGHT

Friendship International Airport, which won the battle for jet flights after Dulles International Airport opened in 1962, has another fight on its hands.

The stakes are the same—jet flights. The enemy is the same—the Federal Aviation Agency. But this time, the going probably will be rougher.

A massive public relations and advertising campaign by Friendship enabled it to counter the novelty of the white elephant Dulles Airport and get back many of the flights airlines had been pressured into transferring to the Virginia facility by the brazen FAA.

But Friendship's campaign was aided by Dulles' location—37 miles from Washington as compared with the less than 30 miles to Friendship. Government officials wanting jet flights preferred Friendship because it was closer.

The new threat to Friendship, situated in Anne Arundel County but owned and operated by Baltimore City, came in an announcement last week by the FAA that National Airport was being authorized to handle certain types of jet aircraft.

Where these aircraft are involved, National will have the advantage of convenience over

Friendship, at least for jet passengers traveling to and from Washington. With its advantage of convenience undermined, Friendship—it is safe to assume—will find it virtually impossible to regain any flights it loses to the facility at Alexandria.

Maryland Members of Congress reacted angrily to the announcement of the highly suspicious decision, sizing it up as another low blow to Friendship. They also cited the greater danger of airplane accidents in the Washington area.

For many years, National's runways—6,870, 5,212, and 4,724 feet long—were considered to be dangerously short to accommodate jet aircraft. Coupled with the air traffic congestion at National, one of the Nation's busiest airports, the short runways—it was felt—would pose a serious danger to densely populated adjacent areas and Government buildings across the Potomac River in Washington.

Now, years later, the FAA has decided that National's facilities are adequate.

This would justify a charge of bureaucratic stupidity if it were not for certain other facts:

The FAA owns and operates both National and Dulles International Airports. Dulles, which cost American taxpayers \$110 million, has been a big bust, losing \$6 million a year. The FAA decided it could recover some of this loss by opening National to jet traffic.

The FAA could not have studied the matter without realizing that some of National's gain would have to be Friendship's loss. It shapes up, therefore, as a deliberate attempt to entice jet airlines away from Friendship to National Airport.

We are waiting now for Friendship International Airport officials to announce, as they did when Dulles opened, that airlines are being pressured by the FAA into moving their operations to National.

If FAA bullishness manifests itself again, we hope Maryland Members of Congress will see to it that a full-scale investigation is made of that Agency's operations.

PORT CLINTON, OHIO, DAILY NEWS CRITICIZES SCHOOL MILK CUT- BACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am glad to say that the press is now beginning to take notice of the recent school milk cutback. On Monday of this week I inserted in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star which criticized in no uncertain terms the Bureau of the Budget's action withholding \$3 million in appropriated funds from the special milk program for schoolchildren.

I now invite my colleagues' attention to a story appearing in the Port Clinton, Ohio, Daily News criticizing the Budget Bureau's action. This is one of the most thoroughgoing critiques of the cutback that I have seen. It succinctly outlines the three points that I have been trying to make day after day on this floor:

First. This move will mean a reduction in milk consumption.

Second. It will result in increased costs to the Government under the milk price support program.

Third. The poor children who benefit most from the school milk program will be the hardest hit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Port Clinton (Ohio), Daily News,
 Jan. 25, 1966]

GUNS FOR MILK (By Steve Esrati)

The Federal Government has been reimbursing schools for milk the schools distribute under a special program. The result had been that children got milk at much lower prices in school than the price charged in stores.

The obvious advantage of such a program is that the children of the Nation's poor were able to get milk. In some school districts, the schools picked up the tab for the poorest of the poor.

Well, it's all over. The Bureau of the Budget, without authorization from Congress, has withheld \$3 million which Congress had allocated to the school milk program.

The effects of this unwarranted Budget Bureau action are manifold:

Less milk will be consumed under the program because local school districts will have to pay more of the costs of the program or pass the added costs to the children.

More milk will have to be bought by the Federal Government under the price support program because less milk will be used in the school program. "This means," said Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, "that the \$3 million saved by depriving the schoolchildren of nature's perfect food will be paid out by the Federal Government for purchasing and storing milk under the price support program * * *. In other words, instead of going into children's stomachs the milk will be powdered and stored in warehouses at Government expense."

The poor children who benefit most from the special milk program will be the first to drop out of the program if the increased cost created by the reduction in Federal participation is passed on to the children.

It is not known who ordered the Bureau of the Budget to cut back the milk money. It may, however, have done so as part of the President's overall directive to cut non-defense spending. In that case, we have guns without milk, a development one cannot call a Johnsonian improvement over the classic guns-or-butter choice.

At the same time, the Federally assisted school lunch program is also in difficulty with the ultimate effect again being felt in the stomachs of the Nation's poorest schoolchildren.

Our farm surplus has been shrinking. The school lunch program has been one of the major outlets for surplus food. Our farmers are told not to grow as much as they might, despite famine in large areas of the world, so that the commodity prices will stay up.

The decreasing supply of surplus foods is also earmarked for purchase by the Armed Forces and, with the increase of hostilities in Vietnam and the growth of our Armed Forces, greater food supplies are headed for the Defense Establishment. There is nothing wrong in saving the taxpayer money by using surplus food for the military.

But there certainly is something wrong if the first Americans who must feel the effect of our increased war effort are the Nation's schoolchildren.

In most Ohio school districts, surplus food dictates the variety of the menu and keeps school lunch prices fairly reasonable. As the supply dwindles, the lunches will either have to cost more or be less and less varied. The end result of this will be that the lunches must either go up in price or become tediously uniform from one day to the other. In either case, those children who get their only balanced meal in school—again the poorest of the poor—will be the first to notice the effects.

Thus, on two domestic fronts, the Nation's schoolchildren are the frontline soldiers of the Vietnam war. If this is the Great Society's way of improving domestic programs without "new taxes," you can have the Great Society. I prefer to think that we are fighting the war in Vietnam to protect the very children who are being made the first home-front victims of the war. Why should they be deprived of milk and wholesome food?

EDWIN C. SCAHILL'S BELLAMY AWARD ADDRESS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, most of us are very familiar with the National Bellamy Flag Award program which was established in 1942 to honor Francis Bellamy, author of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. On October 15, 1965, the 24th National Bellamy Flag Award was presented to Pierre S. DuPont High School of Wilmington, Del. Sharing in the award presentation were student ambassadors from the 23 schools which previously won the award.

This year, for the first time in the history of the program, the student ambassadors were judged on the excellence of their participation, and Honor Medals for Americanism were awarded to the three outstanding students. I am very proud that the 1965 Gold Medal winner, Edwin Carl Scahill, was from my State of Indiana.

Edwin is a student at the Arsenal Technical High School in Indianapolis, which won the Bellamy Award in 1948. Edwin, who is president of the student affairs organization, won his medal on the basis of attitude, cooperation, courtesy, interest in the program, associated activities, merit, personality, promptness, the fulfillment of all outlined obligations, and the initiative which he showed as an ambassador of his school, his community, and his State.

I ask unanimous consent that Edwin's excellent address, which was made on the occasion of the presentation of his award, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arsenal Technical High School, established in 1912 to relieve congestion at two other city high schools, is actually a tribute to peace. Utilizing an active arsenal of the Civil and Spanish American Wars, the 76-acre campus, boasting 60 species of trees, is one of nature's beauty spots in the heart of the city.

The actual Arsenal building, one of six original structures and celebrating its 100th anniversary this year, now houses the administrative offices of our school; 1965 also marks the 50th anniversary of Tech's first graduating class. Nine of the sixteen diploma recipients were honored guests at the alumni celebration held in May.

The collegelike campus satisfies the educational needs of nearly 5,000 day students, 3,500 evening school students, and 1,650 summer school students, with a vast curriculum of academic and vocational courses.

Two major additions have been made in recent years to the ever-growing list of opportunities at Tech. An in-plant high school education program has been instituted in conjunction with three major Indianapolis

industries. This educational opportunity, designed for those employees who were unable to complete their high school education, permits them to attend courses in classrooms within the plant, yet under the supervision and with teachers provided by Tech.

The second addition is the offspring of current transformation to pushbuttons in the business world. The data processing instructional program of the Indianapolis public schools is located at Tech High School. Key punches, collators, interpreters, and verifiers are included in the initial equipment, with future plans to offer computer programming and machine operation.

Our school has received 27 Freedom Foundation awards, more than any other school in the Nation. Our ROTC unit has received 44 consecutive honor rating awards in annual Federal inspections.

It is indeed a privilege and honor to represent Arsenal Technical High School at this annual Bellamy Award presentation. I come from the crossroads of America to the chemical capital of the world to welcome the Pierre S. DuPont High School to our distinguished family.

AN ORGANIZATION ENTITLED "AMERICANS FOR REAPPRAISAL ON FAR EASTERN POLICY"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently a group of concerned Americans, largely academicians and students, launched an organization called "Americans For Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy."

This group urged that an immediate cease fire be established in Vietnam. It called for American readiness "to negotiate toward the recognition of the People's Republic of China," and toward the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

An excellent letter was sent to this group by an American who also expressed his desire for a reappraisal of American Far Eastern policy.

Michael Lindsay asked the group whether it would "propose to formalize the present situation in large areas where the Saigon administration controls by day, and the Vietcong by night?"

While stating that current American policy could indeed undergo some changes with regard to China, Mr. Lindsay criticizes this group for simply accepting an approach with the same implicit restrictions of current policies.

Mr. Lindsay sums up his criticism this way:

My main criticism of your proposals is that they are likely both to encourage the more doctrinaire elements in the Chinese Communist leadership in their delusion that, if they persist long enough in an intransigent policy, the American people will eventually force the U.S. Government to a settlement on their terms, and also to encourage a delusion among the most conventional and unimaginative elements in the U.S. administration that no changes in present policy need to be considered because its critics are too confused and irresponsible to take seriously.

Mr. Lindsay makes a number of interesting points which I would like to share with my colleagues, not as either my conclusions or those of Mr. Lindsay, but simply as subjects for careful thought and consideration.

I request unanimous consent that this statement be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To: Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy

From: Michael Lindsay

I have read the material which you sent me and I feel considerable sympathy for more discussion of Far Eastern policy and consideration of possible alternatives. I also agree that discussions and exchange of information between people in the United States and people in the Chinese People's Republic would be highly desirable. However, when someone asked me how your organization proposed to change present U.S. policy, I replied, "Apparently by assuming away all the serious problems." And I think that this was a fair eight-word summary of the material in your brochure and your "Statement of Purpose."

Your first proposal, on Vietnam, is a good illustration of unwillingness to think about the difficulties of giving an operational meaning to nice sounding generalities. " * * * an immediate ceased-fire by both sides." sounds very nice, but who would be left in control? Would you propose to formalize the present situation in large areas where the Saigon administration controls by day and the Vietcong by night? " * * * administered through the United Nations * * *" also sounds very nice, but the U.N. finds it hard enough to administer cease-fire agreements even where there is a definite front. The people of South Vietnam might benefit from a U.N. administration replacing both Saigon and the Vietcong, but it is most unlikely that either side would accept a U.N. trusteeship.

When you propose that, "The United States should announce its readiness to negotiate toward the recognition of the People's Republic of China", you offer no suggestion at all to deal with the difficulties caused by the present attitude of the Peiping authorities. The Chinese Communist leaders have repeatedly, explicitly and vehemently announced their refusal to accept diplomatic relations except on terms which recognize their claim to sovereignty over Taiwan. Given the U.S. treaty commitment to Taiwan, and given the strong evidence that even those inhabitants of Taiwan who dislike their present regime do not wish to exchange it for Communist rule, this present position of the Peiping authorities seems to rule out U.S. recognition of the Chinese People's Republic as a practical policy alternative. Your proposal seems disingenuous when it presents an announcement of U.S. readiness to negotiate towards recognition as something more than a meaningless propaganda gesture unless you have some suggestions to resolve this problem. And there is nothing in your material to show that you have even thought about it.

Again, your proposals are very misleading in their implicit assumption that diplomatic recognition, and U.N. membership for the Chinese People's Republic are necessarily related to increase contacts. If you had taken any trouble to examine the evidence you would have realized that this assumption was false. Effective contacts between mainland China and Canada, which has no diplomatic relations, seem to be rather greater than those with the United Kingdom, which recognizes Peiping. And the United Kingdom does not seem to have any advantage in contacts over Australia, which has diplomatic relations with Taipei. Japan, which has diplomatic relations with Taipei, has probably had more contacts with mainland China than any non-Communist country which has diplomatic relations with Peiping.

The statements in your brochure by John Bennett, David Reisman, John K. Fairbank, and John Hersey in favor of more contacts and discussions completely ignore

the restrictions imposed by the Chinese Communists on the type of contacts likely to promote the mutual knowledge and understanding which you profess to desire. These Chinese restrictions have varied and were at a minimum during the period of maximum internal liberalization in 1956-57. Since 1957, however, the experience of countries which do not restrict contacts with mainland China shows a fairly consistent pattern: The Peiping authorities have been willing to admit foreign Communists and people who can be relied on to produce favorable reports and to avoid any awkward questions in discussions or interviews. They have also been willing to allow conducted tours with official interpreters and visits by people whose primary interest is in trade or noncontroversial technical subjects. (People who do not know Chinese and have no background knowledge of China seem to have better chances of getting a visa and even visitors who are fully competent in spoken and written Chinese have to employ an officially appointed interpreter.) They have very seldom been willing to allow the type of visit by the type of visitor which could yield reliable independent information about the situation in China, or to give interviews and engage in discussion with people likely to ask searching questions and to challenge demonstrably false answers. Foreign visitors of high enough status to rate a meeting with members of the top Chinese leadership can obtain some private discussion; but the ordinary visitor finds that his Chinese contacts are very reluctant to go beyond polite small talk or repetitions of the official propaganda line.

This unwillingness of the Peiping authorities to allow the type of contacts which could promote mutual knowledge and understanding is not a random caprice. Such dislike of meaningful outside contacts is characteristic of Stalinist regimes which are quite logical in believing them to be subversive. The view of the world presented by Chinese Communist statements is highly distorted and could not be defended in reasoned argument with an informed non-Communist. On the few occasions when the Chinese Communist leaders have engaged in such discussions they have only been able to escape from embarrassing positions by pointedly changing the subject. To allow discussion with people likely to press serious questions would, therefore, weaken the prestige of the present leadership. (I am not claiming that the present U.S. position is entirely defensible, but the situation is not symmetrical. The United States does not make the same claims of infallibility for the thought of President Johnson as the Chinese People's Republic makes for the thought of Chairman Mao.) Similarly, it is very likely that mutual knowledge would be very damaging to the present Chinese Communist leaders by showing that the system for which they have demanded immense efforts and sacrifices from the Chinese people does not really have the advantages which they claim for it. (E.g., the available evidence indicates that the agrarian collectives and communes of the Chinese Communist programs have been much less successful in raising food production than the reformist land policies of Taiwan and Japan.) Thus, any practical proposals for promoting contacts and discussion of a kind likely to produce mutual understanding and knowledge should reckon with the opposition of those who now dominate the Chinese Communist leadership. There is nothing in your material to suggest that you have thought about this problem.

All this does not mean that nothing can be done to improve present U.S. Far Eastern policy, but any useful suggestion of alternatives must be based on much more serious thinking than you have apparently been willing to give to the subject. A curious feature

of your material is that you seem to accept without question the same implicit limitation as those responsible for present policy, that the United States can only act in conventional ways. All your proposals are within the framework of conventional diplomacy although, given this limitation, the defenders of present policy have a better case than you.

In fact, even at the purely technical administrative level there is a strong case for changing conventional procedures. For instance, the United States missed an important opportunity in 1956 when the Peiping authorities announced their willingness to admit American correspondents and the State Department did not agree to validate passports until after the Chinese Communist line had changed with the anti-rightist campaign in 1957. The only defense I have heard of the administration is that present procedures require such elaborate consultations that a quick policy change was not possible. But this is really an excuse and not a defense. It is quite likely that the United States may need to respond to sudden changes in the Chinese situation within the next few years. The death of Mao Tse-tung (born 1893) might well produce changes as great and as unforeseen as the death of Stalin did in Russia. I would suggest that an organization for a reappraisal of Far Eastern policy should give a very high priority to a proposal that the policymaking process in the U.S. Government should be changed in such a way that the United States can respond to new situations offering new opportunities with less than 6 months' delay.

Again, the case for removing present U.S. restrictions on contacts with the Chinese People's Republic can be argued without bringing in doubtful assumptions about the Chinese Communist response. The strongest reason for removing the present restrictions on travel to mainland China is that they confuse the American public. Defenders of the U.S. Government argue that the administration is now, in practice, prepared to validate passports for people who can obtain visas from the Chinese People's Republic. But this only shows their continued failure to realize that the U.S. Government needs the support of an informed public opinion—a failure that was responsible for much of the confusion in Far Eastern policy in the 1940's. So long as American restrictions on contacts with mainland China formally remain, the American public is bound to be confused about the relative responsibility of Peiping and Washington for preventing useful contacts. Consequently, even intelligent and fairly well-informed Americans attach quite unwarranted importance to the reports of the few people from the United States who are able to travel to mainland China, even though it is unlikely that they could obtain mainland China visas unless the Peiping authorities felt reasonably certain that their reports would be highly favorable. There seems to be no reason to suppose that the removal of American restrictions would, by itself, lead to any wider contacts with mainland China than those now available to the British. (If anything, the Peiping authorities would be likely to impose even greater restrictions on Americans.) It would, however, become clear that the responsibility for preventing useful contacts rested with Peiping and not with Washington.

Also, the removal of American restrictions on contacts would give the U.S. authorities the opportunity for making an effective, though unconventional attack on the Chinese restrictions. If the granting of mainland Chinese visas followed the normal pattern, U.S. publicity could stress that the Chinese Communists did not dare to discuss their policies except with those who already largely agreed with them and did not dare to allow their claims about conditions in mainland China to be checked by American

scholars or correspondents whose qualifications would enable them to get accurate information. If the Peiping authorities maintained their restrictions, such publicity could seriously damage their image in countries where they are seeking influence and could, in time, have repercussions in China itself.

Finally, I would argue that the most serious defect of present Far Eastern policy is the lack of any adequate theoretical analysis of totalitarian systems in general and of Chinese Communist mentality in particular, because effective action can only be based on adequate theory. But you offer less than nothing to remedy this defect. Present policy seems to be based on the view that nothing can be done about totalitarian regimes except to follow a policy of containment while hoping that internal developments will eventually cause them to change. While I would argue that this view is inadequate it is far superior to your position which seems simply to ignore the existence of Chinese totalitarianism and Chinese Communist fanaticism, just as Ambassador Joseph Grew in the 1930's refused to face the reality of Japanese military fanaticism.

The real tragedy of the Chinese revolution is the change in men who, at one time, gave their loyalty to the Communist Party and worked for the revolution as means to improve the conditions of the Chinese people. (On the basis of fairly close and prolonged contacts in the early 1940's, I would judge that this motivation was then important for many Chinese Communists.) Now, however, there has been a transposition of means and ends accompanied by increasing dogmatism. Chinese publicity urges the Chinese people to accept four or five generations of sacrifices and austerity, guided by the thought of Mao Tse-tung, in order to serve the revolution. In effect, the Chinese Communist leaders now regard the Chinese people primarily as a means to be used in order to realize their dreams of the future Communist utopia. And anyone who retains his critical faculties must consider it unlikely that their program will actually produce a utopia; an oppressive despotism would be a much less surprising outcome.

It seems to me unduly pessimistic to suppose that this change from thinking of the revolution as a means to serve the Chinese people to thinking of the Chinese people as a means to serve the revolution is necessarily irreversible for all members of the Chinese Communist leadership.

I believe that it is possible to make an analysis (which satisfies the standards for a reasonable scientific hypothesis) of the logical, psychological and social processes which produce totalitarian systems and the rigid, fanatical totalitarian mentality. And I believe that it is possible to deduce from such an analysis the sort of action which would be likely to weaken the hold of a totalitarian system over its subjects and even, in some cases, to assist a breakdown of the dogmatic totalitarian mentality. (The large number of defectors from totalitarian systems shows that such a breakdown can occur spontaneously.)

The message that needs to be put over is something like this, "If the rulers of mainland China are genuinely concerned with the welfare of the Chinese people, they have no cause of quarrel with the U.S. Government.

A strong, independent and prosperous China has been an objective of U.S. policy for the past century. So long, however, as they insist on demanding sacrifices from the Chinese people to impose Communist forms of government on people who do not want them, the United States, by its democratic principles, is bound to oppose them." Those responsible for U.S. policy have been unduly pessimistic about the possibility of putting over such a message, partly because it is unconventional to appeal to the people over the

heads of their rulers, partly because they tend to be uninterested in policies likely to produce results in years rather than months, but mainly because they have not had an adequate theory of totalitarianism which could guide them in the choice of techniques.

You can see from this that I agree with you in wishing for a reappraisal of U.S. Far Eastern policy, but you can also see that I do not consider that your organization is making any useful contribution to a reappraisal. On the contrary, it seems to me that your efforts are likely to promote confusion rather than clarity in the thinking of the American public. My main criticism of your proposals is that they are likely both to encourage the more doctrinaire elements in the Chinese Communist leadership in their delusion that, if they persist long enough in an intransigent policy, the American people will eventually force the U.S. Government to a settlement on their terms; and also to encourage a delusion among the most conventional and unimaginative elements in the U.S. administration that no changes in present policy need to be considered because its critics are too confused and irresponsible to take seriously.

THE PROBLEM OF STARVATION IN EMERGING NATIONS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, many suggestions have been proposed throughout the Nation, and specifically in Congress, which give new approaches to the age-old problem of starvation in emerging nations. Today I would call the Senate's attention to an idea developed by my colleague in the House, Representative Bob DOLE, of the First Congressional District of Kansas, who suggests the Nation should establish a "Bread and Butter Corps."

Representative DOLE has received widespread recognition for this suggestion and will personally present the proposal to the House Committee on Agriculture, of which he is a member. An example of the recognition is contained in an editorial printed January 3, 1966, in the Wichita, Kans., Eagle. I urge all Senators interested in the problem of starvation and the means by which this tragedy of mankind can be averted to read and absorb this editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "DOLE Scores With an Idea" be inserted in the text of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Jan. 3, 1966]

DOLE SCORES WITH AN IDEA

Representative BOB DOLE, who represents western Kansas' big First District, has come up with what looks like a good idea.

DOLE wants the United States to establish a "Bread and Butter Corps." It would be a counterpart of the Peace Corps, but it would concentrate on aiding free world countries in developing their agricultural industries.

DOLE believes it is obvious that American agriculture cannot feed the hungry world, and it is evident that most of the emerging nations cannot feed themselves. His Bread and Butter Corps would be composed of highly trained agricultural technicians—many of them probably from the land-grant colleges like K-State. These would teach farmers abroad how to get the most out of their land.

The Federal Government would subsidize the colleges in providing and training the technicians. DOLE doesn't say anything

will have to be met by the private sector. Both public and private sources are going to be hard pressed to meet the outdoor recreation activity which is expected to triple by the year 2,000, but public expenditures can be reduced by encouraging private investment. The most effective way to accomplish this is by a technical service extension as envisioned by this legislation.

The proposed program would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate officials of the 50 States, and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa to provide technical assistance in outdoor recreation to private enterprise and to local governments. The States would hire the technicians to carry out the work. The Federal Government would share up to 50 percent of the cost of such services. Thus, the pivotal role of the States in the outdoor recreation field would be maintained.

In certain cases where local governments have the capabilities, the States would be authorized to transfer Federal funds to local governmental units to enable such local bodies to provide the technical service to the private sector. This may be desirable for highly urbanized areas.

The cooperative agreement with each State would spell out in advance the procedures and criteria for carrying out the work in that State. It would include such things as the extent of Federal financial participation up to 50 percent of the total cost, how the work is to be done, agreement that competent technicians would be assigned to the work, character of the services to be provided, extent of services to any one recipient, what precautions are to be taken to avoid competition with private consultants in outdoor recreation where such services are available and similar points. Within the framework on the legislation, the cooperative agreements may be varied to fit particular State needs or conditions.

Apportionment of Federal funds among the participating States would be determined only after consultation with a committee of not less than five State officials selected by all the participating States.

In large measure, the proposal is patterned after the existing and highly successful cooperative forest management program.

It is estimated that an average of 5 employees would be needed in each State at the State level and an average of 15 employees per State at local governmental levels, or a total of about 1,100 employees to carry out the program. Thus, the annual cost of the work in the States using State and local government employees would amount to about \$15 million, at least half of which would be borne by the States. In addition, about 20 employees would be needed for administrative purposes at the Federal governmental level, or about \$400,000 annually.

The proposed legislation carries an authorization limitation of \$10 million for the Federal share of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2864) to assist the States in providing technical recreation service and advice to private landowners and local public agencies relating to the management and development of areas for public outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

VN

ACCELERATED ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AID FOR VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

I introduce this joint resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. The resolution is intended to trigger a formal, full-scale congressional debate, including committee hearings, on what is now a new United States-Vietnam policy.

It would support current administration policy, but call for an accelerated program for economic and social development of South Vietnam.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I first introduced a joint resolution seeking to bring this about in June 1965. Since that time, in and out of session, I have done my utmost to bring about Senate discussion on it. I believe this is long overdue, and that the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has been reluctant to give hearings on it, ought to hold hearings as soon as current developments with respect to the Security Council at the United Nations is over, which will be within the next few years.

For more than a year, the administration has not come to Congress for a support resolution on our Vietnam policy, and as a result this struggle in Asia seems to many people to be without necessary congressional sanction. It is the duty of the President and the Congress to face in public debate the consequences of the vast changes that have occurred since the Bay of Tonkin resolution of August 1964. The old resolution is now outdated by events. The sense of Congress on Vietnam should be established as clearly before the Nation and the world as is the position of the President. I have no doubt that such a resolution would result in unification of our policy with the overwhelming support of the American people.

More than a year and a half has passed since the congressional resolution of August 10, 1964; since our ships were attacked in the Bay of Tonkin. We can hardly recognize the Vietnam of today from the picture then.

Then, it seemed the Saigon government, wracked with internal dissention and lacking in popular support, would not outlast the monsoons. Today, there is, at least, a measure of stability in the Saigon government.

Then, the Vietcong seemed able to de-

feat South Vietnamese units, take their arms, and live off the land. Now, they have been joined in large numbers by North Vietnamese regulars and both are dependent on Hanoi for supplies; and the South Vietnamese forces have shown great ability to fight.

Then, the United States was unclear in its objectives and uncertain as to how to achieve them. More soldiers and more speeches, however, did not provide an answer. Today, our goals—freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese, economic advancement and social reform, a stable peace, freedom from fear, return to the Geneva accords, and preventing the overthrow of governments by terror and force—are clear; our means, unconditional discussions and honorable negotiations—are unmistakably sincere and serious to all who will listen.

Then, the United States only had 21,000 advisers in South Vietnam. Right now, there are approximately 200,000 American soldiers fighting in that country and this number, it is predicted, will almost double in a few months.

It is the duty of the President and the Congress to face in public debate the consequences of the vast changes that have occurred since the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. The President should know the sense of Congress on Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I proceed for 2 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. The country and the morale of our troops in Vietnam would benefit from a unified policy of the President and the Congress on Vietnam. Committee hearings and debate should be employed to bring this about.

The argument is made that a substantive debate may give false indications of irresolution on the American position on the Vietnamese struggle. In this respect, I believe far more serious results could follow from isolated statements which even distort the meaning and intent of those who make them. A considered debate, especially if it is designed to result in a deliberate question—duly voted on—is much the preferred way to proceed.

Any question about military security in the course of the debate should certainly be fully answered by the outstanding record of the Congress in the past and by the record of joint committees and committees of both Houses, handling on a daily basis information of the highest security classification.

The President has no reason to fear such a debate; indeed, I have every confidence that consideration of the resolution we propose today would greatly strengthen his position. It would, I believe, also put the Congress on record as favoring the large-scale, coordinated programs of economic and social construction that are so vital if the Vietnamese people are to be able to establish a viable and stable government of their own choosing.

The Congress has been discussing U.S. policy in Vietnam only in a sporadic way, and I believe, focusing on transitory

Angoon from the debt they owe for the cannery.

The people of Angoon have other very heavy indebtedness for individual loans to the fishermen of the community for purchase of the fishing boats which are their only means of making a living. A fishing boat is a necessity for the men of Angoon and in order to acquire their boats the Angoon Community Association has become indebted in an amount of \$539,252.09 to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in addition to the debt owed on the disastrous cannery project.

The people of Angoon cannot, in the foreseeable future, be expected to pay the Federal Government the total indebtedness estimated at nearly \$1 million. I suggest this fact of life might as well be recognized by the Department of Interior and by Congress and that the necessary authority be conferred upon the Secretary of Interior to release the part of Angoon's debt attributable to the cost of the unfortunate cannery.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Angoon Community Association dealing with this matter be inserted in the Record at the close of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2862) to release the community of Angoon, Alaska, from certain indebtedness, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

Be it resolved by the Angoon Community Association, That Congress pass legislation to relieve the Angoon Community Association of the obligation to pay to the Federal Government loans made for the operation of a cannery which was destroyed by fire and for the purchase of fishing boats.

As of the last fiscal year, on March 31, 1965, the Angoon Community Association owed the Federal Government \$467,543.28 for the Hood Bay Salmon Cannery. This cannery was destroyed by fire on February 16, 1961. It is now of no value to the people of Angoon.

In addition, the Angoon Community Association, as of March 31, 1965, owed the Federal Government \$539,252.09, which was used for the purchase of boats. Most of the boats are now old and in need of repair. Total due the Federal Government is \$1,006,795.37.

The requirement of repaying these loans with interest places a heavy burden on the Angoon community and its people. Work is seasonal in the community, since most of the men are fishermen and earn their livelihood from fishing in the summer for salmon. The men and women must make enough in the summer to carry them through the winter.

To illustrate how onerous this burden can become, last summer the Bureau of Indian Affairs required the Hawk Inlet cannery to whom all Angoon fishermen took their catches to deduct from the payment for fish a total of 7½ shares. Payment for fishing is based on a share system. The captain receives 1½ shares, and each member of the crew, usually five to seven men, receives one share. In a six-man boat this would total 6½ shares for captain and crew, as against the 7½ shares retained by the BIA.

The people of Angoon earnestly appeal to their Representatives in Congress to help them; and to pass legislation to relieve them of this obligation to the Federal Government, to allow them to make enough to repair their boats and equipment and to have a better chance to make an adequate living for themselves and their children.

CHARLIE JIM, Sr.,

President,

Angoon Community Association.

JANUARY 24, 1966.

OUTDOOR RECREATION BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to authorize a joint Federal-State program—financed on a 50-50 basis—to provide technical services and advice to private landowners, entrepreneurs, agencies, organizations and local governments in developing and managing outdoor recreation areas. State and local employees would provide the services with the Federal Government sharing the cost.

This bill has been recommended by the National Association of State Park Directors as a supplement to the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. This act, as you all know, assists States and Federal agencies to develop programs which will meet the need of the American people for more present and future outdoor recreation facilities.

In preparing proposals to take advantage of the grants offered in the Land and Water Conservation Act many States have found that there is a gap in the technical assistance available to local governments. This has been true in my State of Utah. Mr. F. C. Koziol, director of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission, has advised me:

Our experience in developing a State master plan for Utah has convinced me that additional support at the Federal level for technical assistance is necessary. Outside of the larger and more populated counties in our State, technical assistance for counties for planning their outdoor recreation opportunities is woefully lacking. At present, except through the limited facilities of our commission and the Agriculture Extension Service, counties and municipalities have no opportunity to get the benefit of professional planners in the development of their recreational services and programs.

The "technical assistance gap" as it has been called, needs to be closed since implementation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is necessarily somewhat slow. It is dependent upon funds available from recreation receipts, and now quickly and comprehensively States can make their recreation plans.

As of January 18, 44 of the 55 States and territories eligible had submitted proposals for planning, acquisition or development of outdoor recreation facilities. The majority of the proposals were for planning grants. About \$3 million had been allocated. Some few States had progressed into the acquisition or development stages, but some had not even completed their statewide plan. My State of Utah was one of these. This all means, of course, that it will be considerable time before any substantial number of outdoor recreational facilities will actually become available to the American people under the program es-

tablished by the Land and Water Conservation Act. The bill I am introducing today would give counties and municipalities the benefit of professional planning and help them to coordinate their planning with that of the State agency.

It also has the broader purpose of encouraging local governments and the private sector to provide additional recreational opportunities, particularly in the parts of the country where population density is high and public resources are limited. This was intended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which pointed out:

Individual initiative and private enterprise should continue to be the most important force in outdoor recreation, providing many and varied opportunities for a vast number of people, as well as the goods and services used by people in their recreation activities.

The National Association of State Park Directors believes that many private landowners and investors would be interested in helping to meet the growing outdoor recreation demands if they felt they had a reliable source of technical assistance and information to guide them in the establishment of a commercial outdoor recreation enterprise where demand is sufficient to return a profit. Present technical assistance programs to the private sector are inadequate because they are limited in scope and to a large degree are oriented toward helping only the farmer, the rural associations and rural landowners.

The association analyzes the problem this way:

A program of technical assistance is needed that will make available to the investor essential information on the potential market for the type of enterprise he expects to develop. Only by a sound analysis of existing and potential factors such as the size of the market; competition from existing suppliers; possible complementary or competitive public areas or facilities; quality and suitability of the site under consideration; capacity and type of structures and facilities desirable; cost of construction, maintenance, and operation of the enterprise; and expected return on the capital investment can the entrepreneur attract risk capital. This kind of technical assistance is not now available.

Much of the needed information is specific in nature and peculiar to the needs of areas or localities within each State. For example, it would be impractical, if not impossible, to provide the specific, detailed assistance required on zoning ordinances, sanitary codes, facility design, liability laws, insurance requirements and the like, at the Federal level. However, Federal support is needed to assist States in providing technical recreation services and advice to private landowners, entrepreneurs, agencies, organizations, and local governments with respect to the management and development of areas for public outdoor recreation.

You will remember that this need was recognized by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and mentioned in the Senate report on the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Act—Public Law 88: 29.

Exclusive of Alaska, approximately three-fourths of the Nation's land is in private ownership. Near population centers, less than 5 percent of the land is privately owned. If the Nation's outdoor recreation needs are to be met, therefore, a large proportion of them

rather than basic issues. Debate should now center on two overriding points: First, the need for greater attention to the social and economic revolution in Vietnam and our identification with the aspirations of the Vietnamese people for economic and social construction, adequate care of the refugees and for a stable, responsive, and just government; and, second, the size and character of the total military effort in Vietnam and where it is taking us.

We urge our colleagues to join us in making such a debate possible through consideration of the resolution we introduce today.

We believe the more support the joint resolution has in the way of cosponsors, the more likely it will have the attention of the committee and assure debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 134) to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia and to supplement Public Law 88-408, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 134

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved August 10, 1964, declared that it "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" and further declare that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia" and "is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member of protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom;" and

Whereas the deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam is waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom has risen in intensity and constitutes a threat to international peace and security; and

Whereas the people of South Vietnam continue to desire the assistance of the United States in protecting their freedom and their right to be left in peace to work out their own destiny in their own way; and

Whereas the United States, without territorial, military, or political ambitions of its own, has labored continuously and diligently for unconditional discussions and negotiations, but has received no positive response for these efforts from North Vietnam or its allies; and

Whereas North Vietnam has used the cessation of bombing in the North to intensify aggression against South Vietnam, requiring the United States so materially to increase the means for defense against such aggression, including the use of the Armed Forces, as to make advisable a further joint resolu-

tion of approval and support by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President as Commander in Chief, in continuing the role of the United States in promoting and maintaining international peace and security in southeast Asia.

Sec. 2. The United States declares its determination, consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, as the President determines for the purposes set forth in section 3 to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Sec. 3. The United States affirms that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities by cease-fire or other appropriate means and the restoration of peace, tranquillity, and security, and the observance of international treaties and agreements in South Vietnam, and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors.

Sec. 4. The United States declares that it is prepared to engage in unconditional discussions and honorable negotiations, whenever and wherever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so.

Sec. 5. The United States recognizes the real struggle in Vietnam must center around the needs and desires of the Vietnamese people for economic advancement and social change, and that to these ends, the Congress declares that it will support accelerated, enlarged, and coordinated efforts by the people of South Vietnam with the aid of the United States to care for the refugees, and to attain the benefits of land tenure reform and utilization, education, health, housing, roads, markets, and the administration of justice.

Sec. 6. The United States regards international action to assure conditions of peace, security, freedom, and self-determination in South Vietnam to be most desirable and is ready to join with other appropriate parties in assuring the maintenance of international peace and applying within that area the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter, through the utilization of the United Nations, of other international organizations, or otherwise.

Sec. 7. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning, on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and at the very close of the morning hour, I introduced a joint resolution on Vietnam which I hoped would result in the President's requesting authority which I felt he should request from Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie at the desk for 1 week to permit other Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Because the President has not sought such authority, the Senator from West Virginia and I have in-

troduced the joint resolution in such form as we believe it ought to be presented.

Unavoidably the Senator from West Virginia was not in the Chamber at the moment the resolution was submitted. I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am deeply appreciative of the comments just made by the distinguished Senator from New York.

The senior Senator from New York has noted from time to time in the Chamber—and recalled again last Friday in a thought-provoking and informative report on Vietnam—that he is an "ardent advocate of a full-scale congressional debate on Vietnam."

The Senator from New York stated that he and the Senator from West Virginia now speaking introduced in June of 1965 Senate Joint Resolution 93. We offered it with the suggestion that it be a focal point for reasoned debate of which I, too, am an advocate.

We jointly requested the Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings on the resolution we offered, but without success. I share the view of the senior Senator from New York that it is understandable if the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee feel that they should not engender hearing and debate on such a sensitive issue unless the President wishes such debate to take place. Our currently proposed resolution is a newly suggested focal point.

But, because I am as convinced as is our colleague from New York that the country supports the President, I feel no hesitancy in cosponsoring the new Senate Joint Resolution 134 "to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia and to supplement Public Law 88-408."

Even among citizens supporting the President on the Vietnam issue there are questions and misgivings susceptible of being mitigated or overcome. Hence, I believe, as Senator JAVITS has declared, that "if Congress is brought into closer partnership with the President on this issue, it is likely that the country will be very much more in favor of our policy."

Congress joined the President in passing the resolution he requested in August 1964. In the light of the many significant subsequent developments, we feel the provisions of that resolution—Public Law 88-408—need supplementation. Certainly there should not be repeal of the August 10, 1964, resolution, as has been proposed in one measure introduced in this body last week.

The late U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, said:

Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains.

The President certainly has made this clear. I believe debate of the issue in Congress through consideration of such a resolution as we offer—although not developing unanimous agreement—would reflect a more overwhelming congressional and public consensus for U.S. policy than now seems on the surface to prevail. The differences over tactics and

strategy and in degree of support too often discolor the picture and in some instances indicate more splinters than consensus. What is needed is a rallying point—a real focal point for a meaningful debate. I do not believe this would weaken the position of the Commander in Chief, nor do I believe it would result in any substantial deviation from the policies he has ordered and proclaimed.

If I did not believe hearings and debate on the issues inherent in the proposed joint resolution would strengthen support for our President and for U.S. policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia, and if I did not have faith that the understanding and resolve of our citizens would be improved by debate in the best traditions of our democratic way of life, I would not be a cosponsor. But I do not shun this joint resolution through negativism; I embrace it with an affirmative attitude.

It is my judgment that the time has come for the Senate to enter into reasoned debate because there have been so many diverse opinions expressed by so many individual Senators that the Senate as a body is somewhat in a posture of disarray and presents a blurred image of itself as a deliberative body and of the Government's Vietnam policy. There is a need for both clarification and a greater degree of unification of the people's Government. We are sorely in need of unity of purpose. If there ever was a time when the executive and the legislative branches needed to be in harmony, it is now.

Mr. President, I am very happy to join the diligent and knowledgeable senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 193.

As I conclude, I invite attention to an editorial and a column written by Richard Fryklund, both published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, February 1, 1966. They are pertinent to our discussion and reflect a degree of optimism that is worthy of attention and consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record excerpts from the editorial, entitled "His 'Clear Duty,'" and Mr. Fryklund's column entitled "Viet Buildup May Be Nearing End."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1966]

HIS CLEAR DUTY

In deciding to order a resumption of bombing of military targets in North Vietnam, Mr. Johnson did what had to be done. As President and as Commander in Chief, conscious of his responsibility to some 200,000 American troops as well as the soldiers of our allies, who are under attack by a relentless foe, he could not have done otherwise.

Obviously, it was not an easy decision to make. And the President, even while giving the order for the bombers to take off, renewed his pledge that the search for a just settlement will go on. One aspect of the quest is the arbitration proposal which Ambassador Goldberg has put before the U.N. Security Council. There is no occasion, however, for soaring hopes on this score. During the bombing pause, which lasted for 37 days, the Communists not only pressed ahead with the fighting; they also used the opportunity to redeploy their soldiers, bring up

supplies, and repair the damage done to their transportation system. To have permitted this to go on indefinitely, as some urged, could only have resulted in heavier American and allied casualties. To his credit, his critics notwithstanding, the President was unwilling to pay this price. As he put it, it is our "clear duty" to do what we can to limit the casualty rolls which, in any event, will be long.

What is to be said of the critics, especially those in the Senate?

In 1776 Thomas Paine wrote that "these are the times that try men's souls." He also paid his respects to "the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot" who, in the crisis of that day, shrank from the demands of the war for freedom. If Paine were living now he might have something to say about sunshine Senators.

It is not our purpose to be invidious in suggesting this. But last week's spectacle in the Senate was nothing less than astonishing.

One theme which runs through the criticism is that Congress, when it approved in 1964 a joint resolution supporting the President's policies, did not quite realize what it was all about, didn't quite intend or authorize the President to do precisely what he now is doing. Yet the language of the resolution is unambiguous. It puts Congress squarely on record as authorizing the President, as he may determine, "to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force," to assist South Vietnam in defense of its freedom. Pretty hard to wriggle out of an endorsement like that.

The 1964 resolution provides that Congress may terminate it by another joint resolution.

Perhaps this should be brought to a test. Let us find out how many Members of Congress, in the face of Ho Chi Minh's adamant refusal to discuss peace except on his own terms, would vote to rescind the authority previously given the President. Let us find out what those who might vote for revocation propose to do about the war, about the 200,000 American troops who are fighting the battle, and whether they intend to waver on our Nation's commitment to a free choice for South Vietnam.

Our guess is that such a resolution could not muster a corporal's guard in Congress. If this is so, there should be an end to aimless speeches and protests which serve no better purpose than to undermine the President and to encourage the enemy.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 1, 1966]

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP—VIET BUILDUP MAY BE NEARING END

(By Richard Fryklund)

The end of the American buildup in South Vietnam could be a lot closer than most people think, both in time and in numbers.

If Communist China does not enter the war, and if Pentagon calculations of potential enemy strength are right, it could level out this spring or early summer considerably below the 300,000 mark.

There are now about 200,000 American military men in South Vietnam. Some Congressmen have predicted a buildup to more than 400,000.

But the Pentagon believes that fewer than 300,000 will be enough—along with the 7th Fleet at sea, the South Vietnamese forces and South Korean, Australian, and New Zealand units—to push back the biggest armies the Vietcong and North Vietnamese can field in the south.

If that calculation proves wrong, however, the planned force will have provided a base able to support a quick, massive buildup.

Plans do change in Washington, and calculations go wrong. But here is the reasoning

behind the present buildup and its projected conclusions a few months from now:

The plans grew out of the dashed hopes of last summer. The Pentagon thought there was a chance then that a demonstration of allied ability to win battles would be enough to induce the Communist side to fade away.

The battles were won as the American Forces grew to 100,000, then 125,000, but the Vietcong just fought harder, and North Vietnam increased its infiltration of regular army troops.

By fall it was clear that our side had to base its plans on the enemy's maximum capability and not assume that he would have the good sense to give in before he was defeated.

Calculations of an enemy's potential are difficult, but the logisticians on our side believe now that North Vietnam and the Vietcong cannot man, equip, and continue to supply a fighting force that numbers more than about 300,000 men.

The plan here is to organize an allied force that can handle that kind of enemy.

"Handle" does not mean a quick victory. It means rather that our side would be strong enough to carry on large-scale offensive operations without a letup.

Right now our side can only guard its own bases and throw hit-and-run raids at the enemy.

Only one-half of the American servicemen in South Vietnam have combat as their primary job—although almost all of them have to fight at least part of the time in order to hold on to their enclaves.

More than half of the combat specialists are needed to protect the bases. Only a quarter of the American force, then, can go out on "search and destroy" operations in areas thought to hold enemy bases.

Search and destroy is a vital part of the military operation. It makes the Vietcong run and it destroys a lot of Vietcong equipment. But it does not seize and hold any new territory.

What is needed is an occupation of Vietcong areas. To achieve this, our side must have enough troops and supplies to maintain a steady flow of equipment and rotating soldiers in endless offensive operations.

As the Vietcong are pushed and harassed and shooed, they will have to leave parts of the roughly one-half of South Vietnam which they now control. As they move out, local government units would be created behind the military shield.

This has been their preferred grand strategy since it was discovered last fall that mere demonstrations of proficiency would not be enough.

But before it could be implemented, a vast logistics base had to be created. American construction crews, military and civilian, have been building and expanding ports, supply depots, airfields, barracks, roads, and air-transport networks.

When the construction is largely finished this spring it will support a force big enough to carry out the sustained offensive operation.

As the logistics base is completed, some of the construction soldiers can go home and more fighting men can come in.

Exactly where the buildup will level off cannot, of course, be predicted accurately. The final orders to move have not been given to many units at home already alerted for duty in Vietnam. But 300,000 is now considered to be a guess on the high side.

If the enemy surprises us with a substantially larger effort than is now thought possible, our base will be able to deliver quickly and support indefinitely several more American combat divisions (the equivalent of about five are there now).

But if present estimates work out, the war could start showing progress this summer. Victory, though, would be a long grind away.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my admiration for the fine statement made by the Senator from West Virginia. It is my great pleasure and honor to be associated with him in this endeavor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope we shall be successful. I believe we shall within the membership of this body many Senators who will wish to cosponsor the joint resolution. I hope that affirmative action can be forthcoming.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2783) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit for a temporary period the duty-free entry of bona fide gifts not exceeding \$50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States, at the next printing: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2722) to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States, introduced by me on October 22, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 622), the Appalachian Trail bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 27, 1966, the names of Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORTON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as "National School Safety Patrol Week," introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF on January 27, 1966.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Address delivered by Dr. Frederick S. Klein, professor of history, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., January 22, 1966, on 159th birthday anniversary of Robert E. Lee.

Article entitled "Year of Crisis or Year of Opportunity," published in the Covington Virginian of Covington, Va., on October 30, 1965, written by Rev. Richard W. Buckingham, of the Epworth Methodist Church, Covington.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Articles dealing with the dedication of a U.S. hospital in Tanzania and tribute to Americans by the President of Tanzania.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL CONTROLS SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many years I have been deeply concerned with the residual fuel oil import quota program and have, on repeated occasions, fought hard for the complete elimination of these controls. These controls cause great hardship to millions of New Yorkers and others living on the east coast of the United States. The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, first in 1963, and then on December 18, 1965, advised that control of these imports could be relaxed without impairment to the national security. Yet the administration refuses to lift its controls, even though the level of imports have been raised modestly for the current fuel oil year. In addition to the anticompetitive situation caused by these controls, they have also resulted in increasing the fuel oil costs of millions of city dwellers, schools, hospitals and many Federal and State installations, who have no alternate choice of fuel. These consumers, who have been bearing the brunt of U.S. Government sponsored price premiums, now find themselves faced, by even higher prices, caused by the setting up of price controls in Venezuela, with the result that for New York State alone, the additional cost may be as high as \$25 million per year.

In my view, and in the view of my colleagues from east coast States, the best solution to the whole residual fuel oil import problem would be the removal of controls.

I am pleased to note that several Congressmen and Senators from various east coast States have arranged to meet today with the heads of interested departments to urge removal of these controls. I fully support their action. I also understand that a committee composed of Senators and Representatives from New England and other east coast States is being formed to deal with this problem on the broadest possible basis. I fully support this move as I believe that only through a concerted effort can we make our concern felt.

We are about to start a new fuel oil year. I strongly urge the President, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Interior, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to review once more the overwhelming evidence developed over the years against residual fuel oil import controls and to abolish these controls prior to the start of the new fuel oil year—April 1.

SUPPORT FOR LAW AND ORDER— RESOLUTION OF SAN JACINTO DISTRICT BOARD OF THE TEXAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the San Jacinto District Board of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs recently adopted a resolution of support for law and order in this Nation. Since this group is so representative of our women's clubs in Texas, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The members of the San Jacinto District, Texas Federation of Women's Clubs in session October 21, 1965, deplore the ugly image that is being presented to the world by lawless demonstrations, marches, and riots. This is indicative of the lack of patriotism and devotion to our country. As loyal Americans we wish to impress upon our Representatives in Washington our desire to firmly stand behind them in their enforcement of law and order. We cannot stress too strongly the need for stamping out this seditious ugliness that is growing in the United States of America. We strongly urge investigation of this communistically inspired attack that is growing more vicious each day. We ask that the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs and the General Federation of Women's Clubs take similar action in demanding enforcement of law and order as presented by this resolution."

Signed by Mrs. George P. Kelley, trustee, San Jacinto District TFWC; Mrs. Paul Lampley, national legislation chairwoman; Mrs. Ralph Morgan, resolution chairwoman.

EDITORIAL IN DEFENSE OF PRES- ENT 2-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Fort Worth Star Telegram of January 23, 1966, carried an excellent editorial in defense of the present 2-year term for Congressmen.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR-YEAR TERM NEEDS LONG STUDY

President Johnson's proposal for an amendment to the Constitution giving Members of the U.S. House of Representatives 4-year terms, instead of 2, should be considered long and cautiously.

What is at issue here is a part of the basic structure of American government—a part included in that structure by the Founding Fathers purposely and with good reason. President Johnson has offered reasons for changing it as he proposes. But there are arguments for not doing so, and there are many unanswered questions as to how the altered system would function and whether it would better serve the interests of the Nation and the people.

Since all Members of the House, under the administration proposal, would be elected at the same time as the President, one fault in the proposed new system is immediately apparent. The winning presidential candidate would tend to sweep his party's House candidates into office with him. Almost invariably, the result would be control of the House and the executive branch by the same political party. This could serve to stifle the voice of the opposition and undermine the two-party system.

The 4-year House terms would mean that the favorable House that came in with the President would be at his disposal throughout his term. The so-called midterm election would automatically be canceled.

In planning the structure as it now exists, the framers of the Constitution incorporated an ingenious system of checks and balances. The 2-year House term gives the President the probable benefit of a cooperative House during the first half of his term. But it also compels him, in effect, to return to the people at the halfway mark for approval—or disapproval—of his conduct of the executive branch.

Accountability of public officials to the people is a fundamental principle of representative government. Mr. Johnson points out that communications are better now than when the Constitution was drafted and says the midterm election is not needed for conveying the will of the people to Congress. But communication and accountability are quite different things, and it is the latter that would suffer most under the proposed change, though truthfully nothing communicates more effectively to a politician than a constituent's vote for the opposition.

Mr. Johnson's four basic reasons for proposing the 4-year change are: (1) to provide House Members a sufficient period to work on the great questions before Congress; (2) to free Members from the pressures of campaigning, thus allowing them more time for their work; (3) to reduce the cost of election to congressional office; (4) to attract the best men into competition for House membership.

It has been proved that Members who do their work in a manner pleasing to their constituents can be returned for many terms. In fact, several present House Members have served longer than any Member of the Senate, where the term is 6 years.

The President's other three reasons have merit. But in the case of each, there are many alternatives for accomplishing the same objective. These alternatives, and many other questions raised by the proposal, should be meticulously explored before there is any decision to alter the basic structure of our Government in a way that could weaken the system of checks and balances and, conceivably, result in one-party rule. Such thoroughgoing study scarcely would leave time for action on the subject at this congressional session.

PROPOSED 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Wichita Falls Times of January 21, 1966, carried a very excellent editorial on the subject of the 4-year term. I ask consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR-YEAR TERMS

Four-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives of Congress will provide one of the livelier topics for discussion this year.

Those who believe that the Constitution provided the perfect framework of government will oppose any tampering with the historical 2-year term which emerged from the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and hasn't been changed.

Those who also take the Constitution literally, and particularly its preamble, which begins, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union" will carefully consider the proposal in the light of present-day conditions and the foreseeable future, and make up our minds accordingly.

There are good arguments on both sides of the issue which the suggested constitutional amendment provokes.

President Johnson, calling for adoption of the amendment, has recited familiar arguments in favor of the longer term: need of Congressmen to devote more time to Congress and less to campaigning, the growing complexities of legislative work, the inducement to political careers of persons of the highest quality.

The opposition also is well armed. It was the theory of the Constitutional Fathers, in compromising on the 2-year term, that Members of the House should closely reflect prevailing public opinion and trends. The short term also acts as a curb upon both the legislative and executive branches of the Government by affording the people the opportunity to repudiate at midterm unpopular administrative and congressional actions.

Actually partisanship has been carefully sidestepped in the proposal that Johnson has made. President Eisenhower favored 4-year terms for Members of the House, and in 1954 during his administration such a plan was approved by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. There are proponents on both sides of the aisle.

It should be noted that President Johnson removed himself and his administration from any conflict with the plan by mentioning 1972 as the suggested effective date of the proposed amendment. That is sufficiently distant to be disconnected with the present administration and the present Congress. In partisan politics, 6 years is a long time into the future.

One crucial decision, it seems to the Times, can provide a compromise that will go a long way toward preserving the advantages of the 2-year term and still satisfy the arguments for the reform. That would be to provide the 4-year terms for half of the 435-Member House in 1972 and the other half in 1974.

The plan of having only half of the House subject to election every 4 years was not suggested by President Johnson; neither was it rejected.

Throughout the Nation, longer terms for public office at the local, county, district, and State level are becoming more popular. Staggered 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives of Congress might be the logical extension of this trend into Federal offices.

THE BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the budget for the District of Columbia public schools sent to Congress by President Johnson last week must be viewed with mixed emotions. In my judgment, while this budget is an improvement over preceding ones, it still does not properly face up to the most important need confronting our Nation—in particular our Nation's Capital—the securing of our future through an adequate investment in the education of our young people. The proposed District school budget is a step toward better schools and should in my judgment be approved, but it should not be considered a prototype for future budgets.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the proposed model school budget for the District of Columbia, which was presented by Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of District of Columbia Public Schools to the House Committee on Education and Labor in response to a request by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI.

There being no objection, the proposed budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1966.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Longworth Office Building,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PUCINSKI: I appreciate your invitation to submit a model budget. Your requests indicate that the purpose of inquiry into the District of Columbia public schools is to be constructive.

My report is analyzed under the following main headings: (1) administration; (2) school services; (3) improvement of instruction; (4) special programs; (5) food services; (6) operation and maintenance; (7) higher education; (8) capital outlay; and (9) application of plans.

The estimates for each element must be understood to be tentative and subject to considerable change as programs are phased in and special facilities are identified.

1. ADMINISTRATION

The proposed increases in funding for administration are based on today's organization.

The School Board plans a study of administrative organization to determine what changes should be made in alignment of staff persons and assignment of duties.

It is proposed to use a part of title V money from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to conduct a study of the design for administrative reorganization.

When this is accomplished, it is inevitable that the costs of administration will differ from the current estimates.

2. SCHOOL SERVICES

The Superintendent's staff has prepared staffing schedules for model school units at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels. The model unit for the elementary school and the junior high school is a school of 1,000, and for the senior high school a school of 1,500. The description of staff services, and supplies has been developed for each unit for each level.

The salient features of the model elementary unit are as follows:

An increase for staffing in counseling, social work, subject fields, shop and home economics, and speech and reading.

Supplying supportive services to teachers as clerks, assistants, and aids.

Staffing for community services to enable each school to serve as a community center with a director of community services to coordinate and initiate neighborhood activities with full use of school buildings.

Reduction in class size in grades 1 to 6 from a current ratio of 30 to 1 to a maximum of 25; in the special academic curriculum to a maximum of 15; and in the social adjustment classes to a maximum of 8.

Establishment of a preschool program with a special staff.

Funds for equipment not now usually supplied, such as typewriters, or fully supplied such as record players, television sets, film projectors.

Increases in funds for textbooks, supplies, and library books, and allocations of funds for cultural experiences, out-of-school learning activities for pupils, and field trips for members of the staff.

The chief improvements for the secondary schools are as follows:

Pupil-teacher ratios reduced from 25 to 1 to a maximum of 25 in the academic classes, with a special provision that in English the number shall be no more than 20 per class.

Ratios in other services will be set at 200 pupils to 1 counselor; 500 pupils to 1 librarian; a full-time speech correctionist for junior and senior high schools, and 1 full-time social worker for senior high schools.

In addition teacher aids and other paraprofessional will be set up at the rate of 1 such employee for each 50 pupils.

We can resolve the whole question very quickly. It can be done by withdrawing the motion to take up. It is that simple.

There is this question to consider: Is compulsory unionism more important than the young men who are slogging among the insects and the slime and the mud of Vietnam? If Vietnam is important, good; then let the President come down to us and ask us to withdraw it. It is that simple.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am looking at the calendar. I see nothing on it relating to Vietnam. I see on it a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla. I see on the calendar a concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America.

I believe the minority leader has the emblem on his lapel.

I see on the calendar a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass. in 1969.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One reason there is nothing on the calendar is that the committees cannot meet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to see the committees meet—all of them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I beg Senators to let the Foreign Relations Committee meet. I have not mentioned other urgent matters that need to be considered. For example, the Panamanian Treaty, which has been a source of much controversy and conflict, ought to be considered. There are a dozen matters to consider if the Senate is to act on them. We ought to let the Foreign Relations Committee meet.

It would be easy to have it done and have it done under the rules.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no control over that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two ways to bring this to a conclusion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to the majority leader, it was the Senator from Arkansas who in the course of mentioning bills before his committee said that there was a request with respect to Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They did that, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say there were bills. The Senator made that statement and I made my response.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order for me to object to the meeting of the Armed Services Committee this morning even though it is

under the guise of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no such request before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to object and to express my objection. I do not think it is appropriate that the Foreign Relations Committee be prohibited from meeting while other committees are allowed to meet.

I do not believe that the military activities there are a bit more important than the military or civilian activities designed, we hope, to prevent the escalation of war.

The Senate is reaching the point where the only thing that is important is the production of a bigger and better war.

I do not understand the procedure whereby they are allowed to continue regardless of the business of anybody else. My committee is criticized in the press as being ineffectively operated, and yet the committee is not permitted to meet. This is an intolerable situation.

Mr. President, is there any way that I can bring before the Senate the question of the continuation of committee meetings when my committee cannot meet?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the 3-minute limitation is over the Senator may make a motion that is debatable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The motion that they not meet. Therefore, I object to the committees' meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

May I say before I start on the remarks I would like to make that I would object to a request made by any Senator to prevent the Armed Services Committee from meeting or any other committee from meeting. But as I understand the motion, the Armed Services Committee, even though it is meeting in conjunction with the Committee on Appropriations for Armed Services, is within its rights, due to the fact that the transaction of morning business has been agreed to, and will be within its rights until the morning business is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I violate the first rule of the morning hour and ask to proceed for 3 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday it was reported in the press that the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry made the following statement:

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam reaffirms that, on the international plane, consideration of Vietnam falls within the competence of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, and not of the United Nations Security Council.

On yesterday, also, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, stated that we call the suggestion of North Vietnam for the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, and today I should like to join him in that request. I do so because it represents my own view and because I know this is also the viewpoint of the administration. Both the President and the Secretary of State have repeatedly said that they would agree to discussions on the basis of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and further they are prepared for a reconvening of the Geneva Conferences. The latest statement to this effect was made by the President in his state of the Union address of January 12, which I will refer to later.

As I stated on Monday, the President is to be commended for referring the question of a possible settlement of the Vietnamese conflict to the United Nations. He is also to be commended for the considerate and sympathetic attitude with which he welcomed Pope Paul's proposal to seek an end to the Vietnamese difficulty through the arbitration of neutral nations.

It gives me much reassurance and encouragement that a man of the caliber of Ambassador Arthur Goldberg represents us at the United Nations at this critical time and that he is making, on the behalf of the President, the principal presentations of our policy on the Vietnamese situation before the U.N. Security Council. I do not know of anyone who is better qualified to speak for the Nation on the matter than this outstanding and judicious American.

I am further heartened and encouraged by the fact that the United States has proposed, through Ambassador Goldberg, that both North Vietnam and South Vietnam be invited to take part in any discussions of a conference to seek peace in Vietnam. Obviously, there is a need for the participation of all those who, in the last analysis, must be parties to understanding if the peace is to be restored and maintained.

Mr. President, I regret to note that, according to the press, North Vietnam has already declared that it will consider as invalid any resolutions of the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam. This report is attributed to Tass, the Soviet news agency. Tass states further in its dispatch from Hanoi that the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry has declared that "only the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina is competent" to deal with the Vietnamese situation.

One would hope, Mr. President, that no possible contribution to peace, from the United Nations, the Vatican, or whatever would be rejected out of hand by Hanoi or any other nation. Nevertheless, it is true that the 1954 Geneva Conference was very specifically convened to deal with the situation in Indochina. That conference rather than the United Nations did set the line of demarcation between South Vietnam and North Vietnam as well as, of course, establishing the national freedom of the kingdoms of Cambodia and Laos, all four areas having been an integral part of what was previously French Indochina.

Hanoi is technically more accurate, therefore, in proposing that questions on Vietnam come before the Geneva conference of 1954. I would suggest, Mr. President, that no time be lost in giving consideration to this proposal from North Vietnam, as announced in the Soviet news agency, Tass. Indeed, I recall, President Johnson not on one occasion but on many occasions, has stated that the United States would be willing to agree to a conference based on the 1954 Geneva accords and Secretary of State Dean Rusk has reiterated that statement many times. Most significantly, in the state of the Union message to Congress on January 12, the President again stated the position with great emphasis:

There are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and consider the views of any group * * *.

I underscore the term "the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962," the phrase "any conference table," and the reference to "any group." If the Tass statements, to the effect that Hanoi wishes the Vietnamese conflict discussed by the Geneva Conference, is accurate and I see no reason to doubt it, since both radio Hanoi and Peiping's New China news agency have carried similar reports, I trust that it means that while North Vietnam is unwilling to have the U.N. brought into the matter, Hanoi is prepared for a reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference and is willing to sit down at the conference table with the United States and with the Geneva Conference of 1954 to consider negotiations based on the Geneva accords. I would hope that these press statements form the nucleus for a negotiating conference and I would suggest the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference of 1954; namely, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, to act immediately on this statement by the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry. I would urge them to convene all relevant participants for the purpose of getting to work on ways and means of settling this question which confronts not only southeast Asia but the rest of the world directly or indirectly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If North Vietnam means what it says, then I think the time is right for the Geneva Conference to be reconvened and would recommend that the effort be made to reconvene it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement of the Senator.

It seems to me, in view of the developments, that this is the proper way to proceed. I hope that they mean what they say when they say the 1954 Geneva Conference has jurisdiction and that

they will come and attend and participate.

I commend the Senator for his statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At least the initiative comes from North Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In this respect I think we should take up their suggestion and if it is a challenge, accept it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield if I have time.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the majority leader, with whose suggestions I wish to associate myself, that this announcement on the part of the Government of Hanoi, attributed to Tass and other agencies, may very well be the fruit of the reference of this issue to the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should say that there is much merit in that suggestion, because it required a Presidential call, through Ambassador Goldberg, to the United Nations Security Council to elicit this comment or reply from Hanoi, which may well work toward a possible reconvening of the Geneva Conference.

Mr. GORE. So even though the prospects in the United Nations are not so happy as we would prefer, it may have already been a very fruitful move.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will yield if I have time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to associate myself with the views of the majority leader and to ask him this question: As he knows, the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference were Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Great Britain has, on many occasions, attempted to persuade the Soviet Union to issue a joint call for the reconvening of that Conference. What is the thought of the majority leader as to what could be done to persuade the Soviet Union to join Great Britain in calling the Geneva Conference back into session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There have been occasions when the United Kingdom has suggested the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, but the Soviet Union has declined to join its cochairman. There also have been cases in which the Soviet Union has indicated that it would like to reconvene the Geneva Conference, specifically, in one instance, on the basis of a question raised by Prince Sihanouk, of Cambodia, with respect to the independence and integrity of that country. But on the other side, it took too long to bring about assent, and when finally a grad-

ing assent was made to the request it was too late.

I would hope that some of the great powers, which seem to act like small boys more often than not, would consider the difficulties which confront, not this country especially, but the world as a whole, would meet and put their heads together, and issue a call for the reconvening of this Conference. Then all that the United Kingdom or the Soviet Union would have to do would be to issue a declaration.

Furthermore, if those two countries do not wish to take that action, any member nation of the 1954 Geneva accords can, on its own initiative act to reconvene the Conference. I hope that in some way that will be done, and that this suggestion, request, or challenge by North Vietnam, issued through its foreign ministry, may be accepted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since we are discussing Vietnam, it is worth noting that on Monday of this week, President Eisenhower, in a telephone interview, said that the President "unquestionably made the right decision in ordering a resumption of bombing in North Vietnam."

Further, he said that any other course would have given "sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam."

President Eisenhower went on to remark:

Indefinite suspension of bombing would only make certain that we would have to face the Communist aggression on other battlefields elsewhere in southeast Asia.

Then he called attention to the fact that we were in South Vietnam by the invitation of the Government of that country. He placed particular emphasis on this subject when he said:

I am for winning the battle here and not in some more remote place not of our own choosing.

He rather scoffed at the contention that we were playing brinkmanship all over again. He said that the enemy had used the pause to strengthen its forces in South Vietnam and to send in more equipment, and also had continued to bomb nonmilitary targets.

He said that there was nothing else the President could do in the circumstances "but order a resumption of the bombing." He rejected the suggestion of General Gavin that U.S. forces withdraw to coastal enclaves along the South China Sea or the Gulf of Tonkin, so as to limit the war while pursuing peace.

I believe that as a former President of the United States, as a former Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as a General of the Army, and as the grand captain of our forces in World War II, his views certainly merit real consideration.

I am confident that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Security Council, and every other responsible person will attach great weight to what the former General of the Army has had to say with respect to the resumption of the bombings.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my hope, when the President decided to call upon the Security Coun-

cil, that some useful contribution might be made by the Security Council.

I predicted that it would be a rather frustrating experience. So far, I have seen nothing to alter the prediction I made along this line.

I hope that the suggestions of the majority leader will lead to an honorable peace. My impression is that this Nation has been ready at all times to urge the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, in the event that there were some disposition on the side of the Communist bloc to try to find an honorable solution to the difference between this Nation and the Communist aggressors.

I suspect, Mr. President, that we shall find our problem to be that the Communists think they can take over a country that does not wish to become a Communist country, and that a great many people who do not want to be subjected to Communist rule can be put under such a rule. That probably will be the difficulty that will have to be resolved.

When there are large numbers of freedom-loving people who do not desire to be taken over by the Communist conspiracy, either by Hanoi, Peiping, or Moscow, it seems to me that this Nation, once having sent its troops there, has a duty not to surrender those people to communism, and, having undertaken to encourage those people to fight in their own defense, we have a duty to stay by their side and see them through.

If a Geneva Convention were convened and this Nation were to send its representatives there for a face-saving surrender, millions of people would be left to the will of the Communists. It seems to me that we should not have been involved in the first place if that were our purpose.

If an honorable peace could be arrived at, I should like to see it arranged. I should like to see our Nation negotiate on any basis whatsoever that might lead to an honorable peace. I should dislike to see our Nation surrender, if it is our intention to go to the conference table for the purpose of surrender.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is a motion in order that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet all day on Friday?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's request would not be in order until the conclusion of the morning business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood a moment ago that the Senate was in the morning hour.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, is the Senate in the morning hour of a period of time assigned for the transaction of routine morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is technically morning business.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas contemplate that if permission is granted for the Committee on Foreign Relations to meet, only those measures which he identified earlier this morning will be considered by the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under the rules, the committee can meet only 1 day. I assure the Senator that we shall have to spend far more than 1 day on the supplemental bill that is before the Senate.

I propose to move, after the morning business is over, that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet all day on Friday next.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only business that will be taken up is the pending business, the supplemental appropriation authorization and two nominations which the Senator knows about.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that the Senate presently has 107 standing, select, joint, and subcommittees.

If we make a dispensation by motion for one committee, whether a standing or select committee, why should not every committee and subcommittee which may have witnesses from out of the city move that it be authorized to do likewise because the Committee on Foreign Relations had been authorized to meet?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator has already pointed out, we have done it for the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services. Why should it not be done for the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Arkansas is the one who objected to the unanimous consent request. I pointed out that, for some 10 or 11 years, I served on the House Committee on Appropriations. That committee had such dispensation. I served for a good many years on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It had such dispensation. It has been a custom of long standing. And there was a very good reason for it.

There are normally about 13 regular supply bills, aside from deficiencies and supplementals. There is a parade of Government witnesses before the subcommittees. The committees could not get their work done.

June 30 is the end of the fiscal year, and, as a matter of course, we have always expected that all appropriations would be completed by the end of the fiscal year. I cannot remember when we have not done that. We have had interim resolutions to carry over the appropriations so that salaries and wages could be paid. There is a very good argument for this being done for the Committee on Appropriations because of the work volume that it undertakes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the Senator means that this matter is much more important than is the war in Vietnam and the world nuclear war with which we are faced? Is that a very incidental matter that the Senate should not be concerned about?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether compulsory unionism or freedom of choice or compulsory membership in a union is more important than the youngsters over there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows what I think about that. I believe this bill ought to be taken down. I agree with what the Senator said. Either that should be done or cloture should be invoked.

I am perfectly willing to vote to take it down. However, I cannot control that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is my understanding that a motion that a committee meet during the session of the Senate is not in order under the unanimous-consent request under which the Senate is operating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the morning business is over, the pending business will be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there further morning business? The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be in order for me to make a statement on the procedure of the Senate during the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement while my good friend the Senator from Arkansas is on the floor.

As one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I want the Senator from Arkansas to know that it is the view of the senior Senator from Oregon that, although we cannot meet while the Senate is in session, we can meet at 8 o'clock in the morning and have breakfast. I suggest that we start having meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations at 8 o'clock in the morning. If we are to keep banker's hours and not make an effort to break this filibuster, and if we continue to go home at 4:30, 5, 5:30, or 6 at night, even before the Riggs National Bank president leaves his office, we shall never be done. I suggest that we schedule public meetings at 6, 7, and 8 o'clock at night.

The people are entitled, may I say most respectfully, to have the Committee on Foreign Relations meet whenever it can meet under the rules of the Senate. The rules do not apply after adjournment or recess.

I believe that we ought to start having evening meetings and public meetings. The American people are entitled to know where the Committee on Foreign Relations stands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator give me any indication of his belief that we could get the Members there? Speaking for myself, I am perfectly willing to do that if I think I can get a quorum present to hear the witnesses.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that people are entitled to know who the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are in this hour of crisis who find it inconvenient to attend a meeting, no matter what hour of the day or night the Senator calls the meeting.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I am correct that, if Senators care to do so, they may call a group of Senators together. There is no rule that states that a group of Senators cannot meet to talk about a matter.

As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, if the committee meets and seeks to keep a transcript or record of such meeting, the committee chairman can be made to pay the cost of the record. However, if a record is not kept and Senators merely meet and discuss matters, they can later make their action official when they meet at a time when the Senate is not in session.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the Senator from Arkansas cares to call a committee meeting after the Senate completes its business or before it meets tomorrow morning, I shall endeavor to be present. I cannot promise to deliver the other bodies, but I can promise to give to the Senator whatever cooperation I am able to make available to him.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. If the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], at the conclusion of the morning business, were to request that the Foreign Relations Committee be permitted to meet, would he not, in effect, be attempting to suspend the rules; and would such a request be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate provide that the committee may not meet during sessions without leave of the Senate, except under certain conditions and it has held that an attempt for a leave can be put in the form of a motion under the rules. It has been ruled by the Chair that it is debatable and privileged.

Mr. TOWER. It would be a privileged motion, then, and would need to carry only by a simple majority to accomplish the end desired by the Senator from Arkansas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. That motion would be debatable, and the rule of germaneness would apply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. And any speeches made on that motion would not be charged as debate on H.R. 77?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe the leadership would feel obligated to move to table such a motion. We have before us a motion which involves a very important matter, which the leadership feels should come to a vote. The leadership recognizes and well knows that a motion for committees to meet could indeterminably extend the debate in which we are presently engaged.

Speaking as one Senator and as the chairman of a committee with similar problems, I should very much hope that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would not insist upon making such a motion to meet while the Senate is in session. As a member of his committee, I would do what I could to help provide for the presence of Senators and assure him of my own presence at the meeting, if he sees fit to call a meeting of his committee after the Senate has concluded its session today or before the Senate meets on tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In response to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana, in the first place, I have not enough time, now, to arrange it today. I would like permission for the committee to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday. I see no reason why such permission should not be granted, because I submit that under the present conditions, with the administration urging us to give them a supplemental authorization of \$415 million—and I can assure the Senator that they have urged me; I assume that they need it, that they have run out of money—this is not a mere routine matter upon which I am asking permission for the committee to meet.

Such permission has already been granted to the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe this is a normal, ordinary matter. I think it is of sufficient importance to justify allowing the committee to have one meeting during the Senate session. One reason why I should particularly like to have one meeting—for which I think I can get the members of the committee together—is even to discuss the matter raised by the Senator from Oregon, as to whether we can reasonably hold meetings in the evening. To my knowledge, it has never been done. If the members would agree to come in and we can obtain the witnesses and hold meetings, that would suit me; but I should like to have a meeting in which we can determine whether or not it is a feasible way to proceed. If so, I shall try to accommodate to it.

I ask permission for only 1 day; I am not asking permission for the entire year, which was given to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if need be, if it cannot be done any other way, the Senator from Louisiana would urge the majority leader to consider recessing the Senate while the Senator from Arkansas calls his committee together.

But I have known occasions, when a committee was pressed to get work done,

when evening sessions were held. When the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was rushing to report an amendment to the Taft-Hartley bill in 1949, that the committee met following Senate sessions until late every night. I recall an occasion, when one member of the Finance Committee was strenuously opposed to the reciprocal trade bill, and that committee sat until after midnight every night for a week in order to conclude its hearings and hear all the witnesses who had been scheduled.

I urge that the Senator from Arkansas discuss the matter with the majority leader on a personal basis, and that we try to find a way to accommodate the Senator, because I realize his problem. I assure him that I personally will cooperate in any way I can.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, any Senator would definitely be within his rights to move to table such a motion. I wish to make it clear to my critics, on behalf of the committee and for myself personally, that we are not being dilatory on the matter; we would like to move on.

Mention has been made of the importance of the Appropriations Committee. For the past 2 or 3 years, our committee has been blamed for difficulty in connection with foreign aid. It is true that the foreign aid bill, and that bill alone, delayed the adjournment of the last session of the Senate; and that is another reason why I think the Foreign Relations Committee should not be thwarted in its efforts to dispose of this business, which is extremely important at the moment; it is not routine business. Our being allowed 1 day would be fully justified, so that I can get the members together and we can make plans, and determine whether it is at all possible to meet during the evenings. We are not trying to dispose of routine executive business; we are talking about witnesses. As the Senators know, we cannot always get a witness to come in at 8 o'clock in the morning or at night, but perhaps such arrangements could be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there a motion presently before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No question is pending.

Is there further morning business?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since a motion to table is not available, I wish to use the 3 minutes permitted under the present parliamentary procedure to commend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. As he has stated, the administration has urged our committee to expedite consideration of the resolution pending before it for additional funds for aid to South Vietnam. I am not advised as to the degree of urgency, but the administration seems to think it is very urgent.

We are caught in a filibuster; let us acknowledge that fact—a filibuster not on repeal of 14(b) but upon a motion to take it up for consideration.

I suppose that the senior Senator from Tennessee is about the most reluctant

available. Let it be invoked. Let us determine the issue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President—

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, all the arguments made today have a familiar ring to me. I have heard them all before. During the 17 years I have served in the Senate, I have been both with the filibusterers and against the filibusterers. I understand the arguments on both sides. I have used them at much greater length myself. I have made the same argument that my friend the Senator from Nebraska has just made. Therefore, I understand the arguments on both sides of this issue.

The Senators who are trying to move for repeal of section 14(b) are not going to set this matter aside. We are going to pursue it. We are not going to bring up debatable motions. We will find some way to deal with the problem stated by the Senator from Arkansas. We will find some way to work it out, either to urge him to get his committee together when the Senate is not in session, before or after; or if need be, we can recess the Senate so that he can call his committee together. Therefore, we will find some way to work out the problem. There is nothing new about this situation, because Senators who are engaged in extended debate to prevent the matter from coming to a vote have every right to object to any committee meeting. We respect that right. That is a right under the rules. We have to accord them that.

Mr. BASS. Last year, as I remember, the Senate was considering a baseball resolution. Was there not some extended debate about Baseball Week? I believe that committees met during all that time. I do not know whether that issue prevented committees from meeting when extended debate was indulged in on such an important issue as the question of Baseball Week.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senate gave us permission to meet.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have the floor, but let me say that Senators who are engaged in extended debate have every right to object to any committee meeting while the Senate is in session. It is entirely within our right. Inasmuch as the rules make it presently debatable, we do not wish to bring in another debatable motion while a motion to take up section 14(b) is being debated.

Mr. BASS. I wish it understood that I do not question our rights under the rules. All I am saying is that the RECORD should show who is holding up progress. It is not those who wish repeal of section 14(b) at all. All that has to be said is this: An important measure which has passed the other body, and which has been reported by the committee in this body, could now become the business of the Senate. But our opponents are even preventing the Senate from deliberating. All they have to do is say: "We will vote on the issue." It would then all be over.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that the arguments on both sides have been clearly stated, and I therefore hope that the Senate will now get on with its business.

Mr. HART. Mr. President—

Mr. BASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, would I be out of order to transact routine business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would be in order to do so.

Mr. HART. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object, if that goes beyond the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has allotted 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, am I in order to proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is in order to proceed.

VIETNAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Mr. Erwin D. Canham has written an article in the Christian Science Monitor of yesterday entitled "World Larger Than Vietnam," and I believe that he has made his point very clear. It would be prudent for all Senators to read the article and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD LARGER THAN VIETNAM (By Erwin D. Canham)

Vietnam is important. But it really should not overshadow the world. There are other problems, other challenges, other successes. The nations have other work to do.

The United States has plunged into a division over its policies in Vietnam which is deeper and more troublesome than in any similar crisis for many years. The division is deeper than it ought to be, and probably appears deeper than it is in fact.

To hold the Vietnam issue in something like its true proportions, a number of affirmations can be made:

The United States has no intention of permitting itself to drift into a war with Communist China. It would only engage in such a war if grossly provoked.

Probably, it is equally true that Communists China has no intention of permitting itself to drift into a war with the United States. It evidently seeks to harass the United States to its fullest ability, drawing American forces into deeper and deeper involvement in Asia, but always short of direct United States-Chinese war. Peiping's policies have at all times been cautious. It is interested in inexpensive victories, not costly ones.

NO SURRENDER

The United States has no intention of surrendering in Vietnam. It is eager to withdraw under tolerable terms, including terms which might lead to Communist rule if it turns out to be the wish of the Vietnamese people. But it does not intend to be driven out. It is in Asia for the sake of the freedom of Asians.

It is also probable that the United States has no intention of escalating the Vietnamese war beyond the bare minimum

needed to maintain a reasonable position leading to negotiation. It is likely, too, that with the resumption of bombing it will be in ways directly supporting U.S. forces and inhibiting direct North Vietnamese penetrations into South Vietnam. It is most unlikely to include attacks on Hanoi or Hai-phong.

Beyond these affirmations, some other basic situations should be noted:

American-Soviet relations are in no crisis. The world's two greatest powers have come to understand each other fairly well, with certain policies more or less in parallel. There is no crisis over Berlin or Germany. Such a crisis could be infinitely more dangerous than a crisis in southeast Asia.

EEC RESCUED

The European Common Market has again been rescued from collapse. The British Government has won an unexpectedly successful by-election, promising greater strength and stability for the period ahead.

India's Government has passed into promisingly capable hands, although it is too soon to draw many conclusions. The Tashkent agreement is still intact. There are no immediate threats of great Communist penetration in the various southeast Asian states, each of them vulnerable to pressure, but still holding on. Communism has suffered a massive setback in Indonesia.

In Africa, though military takeovers are disappointing and assassinations dismaying, the alternative of extreme leftwing or Communist revolutions would be even more threatening.

FOOD NEEDED

Beyond doubt, the greatest problem in the world is not the pesky guerrilla war in Vietnam, but the famine or threat of famine in many lesser developed parts of the world. Hunger is great in India, is growing apace in Latin America and Africa. All the more developed nations, not just the United States, will soon have to take more seriously than ever before the need to support the expansion of food production, and other necessities of life, both in their own nations and in the raw materials countries.

It is tragic that so much of the world's atmosphere has been poisoned by the Vietnam riddle. It is distracting. Communism's penetrations in Africa, Latin America, and some other parts of Asia are frequently being set back. But in Vietnam a combination of circumstances gives communism its greatest advantages and the United States its greatest handicaps.

Such things happen sometimes in the affairs of individuals and families, as of nations. The United States and its thoughtful friends, should not lose their balance and commonsense. The issue can be resolved.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, since the truth packaging bill was first introduced 3 years ago, the number of words it has generated—in favor and in opposition—could doubtlessly provide a ladder to the moon, if properly joined and fitted.

It can be safely stated, I believe, that the words from both sides have not diminished—either in number or intensity. As I see it, this debate has helped the consumer in two ways—it has made him increasingly wary in the supermarket and it has reassured perceptive shoppers that they are not alone in their desire for a clear presentation of relevant information.

In total number, the consumer movement is an impressive one—some 60 million family shoppers wind their way up